ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL HAZARDOUS WASTE PUBLIC CONSULTATION MEETING: TRANSCRIPT

AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE DU CONSEIL DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT SUR LES DECHETS DANGEREUX: COMPTE RENDU

MONCTON, NEW BRUNSWICK/NOUVEAU-BRUNSWICK

FEBRUARY 12, 1986/LE 12 FEVRIER 1986

Conseil de
l'environnement
du Nouveau-Brunswick: 1986

New Brunswick
Environmental
Council: 1986

INDEX OF SPEAKERS/LISTE DES ORATEURS

MR. B. BEUKEVELD 21, 24, 25, 50, 76

MLLE M. CARON 50, 51, 52, 56, 57, 58, 59

M. G. DOUCET 80, 81

M. D. FERRON 28, 32, 33, 34

MR. GILCREST 34, 36, 37

MLLE S. GODIN 30, 31, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 80, 81

MR. G. HILL 71, 74

MR. D. KERR 9, 10, 18, 29, 67

MR. LAKSHMINARAYANA 13, 20

MR. K. LANGMAID 10, 11, 35, 36, 42, 43, 68, 74

M. L. LAPIERRE . . . 1, 9, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 40, 41, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 65, 67, 69, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 79, 82

MR. H. LEBLANC 38, 40, 41, 42, 43,

MS. V. LEBLANC 65, 67, 68, 69, 71,

MRS. M. LEBLANC 72, 74, 75

MR. B. LUTES 26, 27, 28, 43, 44, 45, 70, 75

MR. V. MALLET 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13

M. G. MARTIN 79

MR. M. MEHRA 60

M. G. POTIER 62, 65

MR. D. SILLIPHANT 19

MR. D. SMITH 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 70

MRS. H. TAYLOR 28, 67, 68

LAPIERRE:

Bonsoir. Avant de débuter, j'aimerais inviter ceux qui auraient besoin d'appareils pour la traduction de se rendre en arrière, je crois, pour les obtenir.

Those of you who would need translation devices, you can obtain the devices at the rear of the hall, I think. They're not there? They're over here on the table. So if any of you need before we start, these devices, because there will be, I think, discussions in both languages, so if you don't want to miss any of it. As soon as the individuals have their listening devices, we'll be under way.

Alors, je vous souhaite tous la bienvenue à la deuxième réunion des audiences publiques qui ont lieu à la grandeur du Nouveau-Brunswick sur les déchets toxiques au Nouveau-Brunswick. Comme vous le savez, depuis plusieurs années, les déchets toxiques sont devenus à tous les jours des items qu'on peut retrouver aux nouvelles. Et ce sont souvent les résultats de nos activités des derniers vingt-cinq, trente ou quarante ans qui maintenant arrivent nous visiter sous une autre forme. Alors le gouvernement du Nouveau-Brunswick est conscient du fait que la pollution par les déchets toxiques est quelque chose qu'au Nouveau-Brunswick, on peut difficilement accepter et dans cette activité et dans le but de l'aider à préparer des règlements qui vont éliminer à l'avenir les déchets toxiques de notre environnement, le gouvernement sollicite vos idées.

Alors, avant de débuter, j'aimerais simplement vous présenter les membres qui sont ici avec moi ce soir. Premièrement, moi-même, je suis Louis LaPierre. Je suis professeur de biologie à l'Université de Moncton et je suis aussi Président du Conseil de l'environnement du Nouveau-Brunswick.

To my far right is Ken Langmaid. Ken Langmaid is a soil scientist and now resides in St. Andrews. Next, to my right is Mrs. Helen Taylor. Mrs. Taylor is a retired businesswoman and she resides in Doaktown.

On my immediate left, Mr. Don Smith. Don Smith is from Belledune. And on my far left, Mr. David Kerr from Edmundston. Both Mr. Smith and Mr. Kerr are professional engineers.

Comme vous le savez, le Conseil de l'environnement est composé d'un groupe de citoyens qui sont nommés par le Ministre afin de le conseiller sur tous les items qui touchent à l'environnement. Il se veut que présentement on parle, ou on traite des déchets toxiques ou dangereux et des déchets en général si vous voulez, mais à l'occasion, on traite de tous les sujets qui touchent à l'environnement. Alors, si vous aviez des questions sur d'autres sujets de l'environnement quoi qu'on veut que ça se maintienne autant que possible aux déchets toxiques et aux déchets dangereux, vous êtes bienvenus de nous les faire connaître pendant notre séjour à Moncton.

En entrant ce soir dans la salle, vous avez eu la chance de voir sur la table une série de dépliants. Il y a un de ces dépliants qui est, je crois, plus important que les autres... celui qui s'intitule "Les déchets dangereux au Nouveau-Brunswick: Etat de la situation en 1985". A l'intérieur de ce document vous allez trouver un plan d'action. Un plan d'action que la province propose afin de voir à la gestion des déchets: non seulement toxiques, mais des déchets en général pour le Nouveau-Brunswick. Comme vous le savez, si vous avez déjà visité des dépotoirs au Nouveau-Brunswick, c'est pas toujours l'endroit où vous voulez demeurer le plus longtemps. On souvent dépose les sacs, puis on se tourne le dos, puis on se sauve. Alors, si on veut se sauver, imaginer qu'il y en a plusieurs sites comme ça dans la Province, au delà de 200 même, qui sont pour la plupart pas toujours très propres.

Alors, le gouvernement a décidé qu'on aimerait réduire le nombre de ces sites-là. Et pour ce faire les sites des déchets domestiques vont être réduits à un nombre considérable, peut-être une cinquantaine ou peut-être un peu plus, mais et ces sites-là vont être gérés par des commissions régionales... j'insiste une commission régionale. Il ne faut pas oublier que les déchets c'est quelque chose que tous et chacuns d'entre nous on a une responsabilité. On fait tous partie d'une société qui, aujourd'hui, déverse une grande quantité de déchets dans l'environnement. Tellement même qu'on est pris au dépourvu de s'en débarasser. Alors, dans le passé on a toujours regardé les déchets et si vous faites le tour en histoire vous verrez qu'on a très peu évolué du temps des Romains même avec nos déchets. On utilise à peu près les mêmes techniques, peut-être d'une manière peut-être pas aussi efficace qu'ils le faisaient.

Alors, je crois qu'on a évolué, la société autour de nous a évolué et on doit reprendre et revoir nos méthodes. Alors, pour ce faire, le gouvernement a décidé qu'il n'y avait pas de meilleures personnes pour faire ça que les gens qui allaient générer les déchets. Alors, il va y avoir dans la Province entre onze à quinze Commissions régionales qui vont être nommées et ces Commissions-là vont être des entités légales qui vont eux-même s'occuper de gérer les déchets d'une région. Alors, ces déchets, les déchets généraux, les déchets de maison, les déchets domestiques sont gérés à un dépotoir central et il y a pas en dire que le coût doit être....le coût de ces dépotoirs nécessairement devra en venir à ceux qui l'utilisent. Alors, je crois que ça c'est le numéro un de notre plan.

Le deuxième c'est qu'il y a des déchets qu'on peut pas entreposer partout dans la Province. Il y a des déchets qui sont des déchets comme l'amiante, par exemple. Les déchets qu'on considère qui doivent être enfouis d'une manière particulière. On doit y porter un soin particulier. Ces déchets-là, on propose de les enterrer à des sites spécifiques de la Province. Si on regarde, on regarde peut-être entre trois à sept sites bien spécifiques où les gens pourront déposer des déchets qui sont considérés comme dangereux mais qu'on peut contrôler les dangers et qu'en guise d'exemples je cite l'amiante.

Le troisième type de déchets qu'on a dans la Province ce sont des déchets dangereux, des déchets chimiques et si vous parcourez le document que je vous ai mentionné à tantôt ,vous verrrez qu'on en produit à peu près 1,800 tonnes par année. Si vous voulez voir de quoi est composé ces 1,800 tonnes-là, vous pouvez voir à l'intérieur du document qui ça vient à peu près de partout. Il y en a qui viennent de l'industrie, il y en a qui viennent des écoles, des hôpitaux, ça vient de partout. Maintenant certains de ces produits-là on peut les neutraliser par exemple, on peut en faire, on peut les recycler. Alors pour un certain nombre, c'est ça qui sera fait. Mais il y a une autre quantité qui ne peut pas être recyclé, pas dans la Province actuellement. Puis afin d'avoir un système qui nous aiderait de les recycler ça sera bien dispendieux parce ce que beaucoup d'entre eux ont besoin d'être incinérés.

Alors, on propose pour ces déchets toxiques de les envoyer hors de la Province, soit au Québec, ou à l'Ontario. Et là ils pourraient être incinérés et ainsi détruits.

Alors, si on en vient au troisième type des déchets toxiques, ces déchets devront non seulement être envoyés en dehors de la province donc pour le moment le Québec et l'Ontario semblent être disposés d'accepter ces produits. Il suppose un certain nombres de problèmes, puis c'est des problèmes que j'aimerais vous en faire part, puis par la suite on aimerait que vous nous fassiez connaître vos opinions sur ces problèmes-là.

Le premier c'est qu'il faut que ces produits-là soient entreposés. Si vous avez écouté les nouvelles les derniers jours, vous avez vu qu'on a essayé d'entreposer un certain nombre de produits à certains endroits dans la province et vous savez que la réponse n'a pas été tout à fait favorable. Maintenant il y a pas de questions que probablement il y a pas tellement de gens qui voudront avoir un dépotoir ou un entrepôt de produits toxiques dans leur cour arrière. Mais il ne faut pas que vous oubliiez que les produits toxiques c'est un problème social. C'est nous la société qui bénificions de toutes les découvertes modernes, de toutes les activités modernes et à l'intérieur de ça, on a une responsabilité sociale de voir à ce que les déchets soient entreposés d'une manière à ne pas perturber notre environnement... ni aujourd'hui, ni plus tard. Il ne faut pas oublier que l'environnement que nous avons hérité de nos grand-parents, c'est celui qu'on va laisser à nos enfants aussi. Alors, si on peut enfouir des produits toxiques dans le sol pour plusieurs années. Mais plus tard ces produits-là arrivent tôt ou tard à la surface. On n'a qu'à voir ce qui se passe actuellement en Ontario. Donc, simplement dire, moi je ne veux pas de produits dans ma cour, c'est une solution que vous pourrez probablement empêcher qu'ils ne soient déposés dans votre cour. Mais c'est pas la solution aux produits. Les produits, ils doivent être déposés à quelque part. Maintenant il s'agit de trouver en societé, la meilleure méthode de déposer de ces déchets-là.

En même temps j'ouvre une parenthèse ici je vois qu'il y a plusieurs étudiants dans la salle. Je suis content de voir qu'ils sont ici. N'oubliez pas que l'avenir, c'est à vous l'avenir. Vous devez penser à qu'est-ce qu'il va arriver aux produits toxiques. Vous avez le droit de nous dire qu'est-ce qu'on doit y faire. Parce que nous, aujourd'hui on est la société qui dirige l'environnement. On est ici, on va être parti plus tard. C'est vous qui allez prendre la relève... Mais je souhaite que vous voulez un environnement qui va être aussi sain que celui que nous on a hérité de nos grands-parents.

Alors, je crois qu'un tel environnement demande qu'on prenne conscience des produits qu'on a, des produits qu'on génère à chaque jour dans nos sociétés. Et qu'on doit, et qu'on a une responsabilité morale de voir à ce que ces déchets-là soient entreposés d'un manière ou d'une autre.

Maintenant si on entrepose les déchets en attendant qu'ils soient envoyés à l'extérieur de la Province ça va demander des sites. Qu'est-ce que vous pensez que... où pensez-vous que ces sites-là devraient être... que pensez-vous?

Est-ce que ces sites devraient être...est-ce que les déchets devraient être entreposés dans ces sites pour des longues durées de temps? Ou est-ce que ça soit des courtes durées de temps? Maintenant voulez-vous.... d'une manière ou d'une autre, les déchets vont être envoyés au Québec. Il va falloir qu'ils voyagent à quelque part. Il va falloir qu'ils voyagent sur nos routes. Est-ce-que vous aimeriez savoir où ils voyagent? Quand ils vont voyager? Est-ce que vous pensez qu'il serait mieux qu'ils voyagent la nuit que le jour? Est-ce qu'on devrait avoir des règlements qui exigeraient que tous camions qui transportent des produits chimiques, nous remplissent un document, et qui nous disent qu'est-ce qu'il y a dans le camion? Si ces choses-là c'est des choses que vous aimeriez voir, je souhaite que vous nous le disiez, vous nous le fassiez savoir.

Maintenant, il n'y a pas de question que tout ce qui va être fait va coûter de l'argent. Si vous êtes un homme d'affaires à Moncton, et qu'on décide de placer un site à un endroit dans la Province qui est éloigné, il va falloir qui vous payiez pour le transport au site. Alors, je crois qu'il faut pas oublier que tous programmes coûtent de l'argent. Vous, comme citoyen, ou comme payeur de taxe, êtes-vous prêts à payer pour faire en sorte que l'environnement soit maintenu dans un état ou toute la vie peut subsister.

Alors, pendant nos audiences ce sont des points qu'on aimerait connaître vos opinions. On aimerait que vous nous fassiez connaître vos opinions sur l'entreposage des déchets toxiques. Si vous avez des questions spécifiques sur les règlements de la Province, nous avons dans la salle ici des employés du gouvernement qui sont prêts à répondre dans la mesure du possible aux questions que vous avez à leur poser.

La session, ce soir, maintenent que je vous ai fait un bref exposé d'à peu près de ça qu'on aimerait voir, j'espère que vous aurez des commentaires. On a divisé la session en deux parties, si vous voulez.

La première partie, on n'a pas eu d'avis qu'il y avait des personnes qui avaient des documents spécifiques à nous présenter, dans ce sens qu'ils avaient préparé un document écrit qu'il voudraient nous en faire part. Alors, ce que je peux faire c'est simplement cuvrir la salle aux discussions et s'il y a des gens qui sont prêts à faire des interventions, à poser des questions, je vous demanderais de vous approcher d'un des micros et de vous identifier premièrement, et par après, poser votre question ou nous faire part, si vous voulez, de vos recommandations ou vos discours.

Est-ce qu'il y a des gens qui veulent faire des présentations ou....OK. Alors, j'ai deux mains, je vais demander simplement à M. Mallet que je connais donc de s'approcher d'un des microphones, peu importe, celui au centre ou celui du côté, il n'y a pas de problèmes...

Avant de commencer, j'aimerais signaler ... I'd like to indicate that we have another member of the Environmental Council in the audience this evening, Mr. Bert Hawkes, from Hillsborough. So Bert is not a member of the panel, but a member of the Council and he has chosen to come here tonight to listen to what is being said.

MALLET:

M. le Président, membres du comité, ça me déplait un peu de commencer parce que j'ai pas vraiment de solutions à vos problèmes. Je pensais qu'il y aurait d'autres interventions avant la mienne puis je pourrais ensuite arriver avec des bonnes idées. Mais en fait, il faut toujours que quelqu'un commence avec ce genre de chose.

Alors, j'aimerais m'identifier. Je suis professeur au département de chimie à l'Université de Moncton et je suis coordonnateur d'un groupe de recherches en sciences environnementales à l'Université. C'est un groupe de recherches qui a été créé en 1976 pour justement traiter des questions d'impact environnemental etc., et je voulais vous faire part de ceci. Comme groupe on travaille ainsi comme professeur et puis, qui ont de l'enseignement à faire etc. alors on a très peu de temps à consacrer à faire des recherches personnellement là-dedans.

C'est pour ça que tout dernièrement on a mis sur papier un document pour créer un centre de recherches en sciences environnementales à l'Université de Moncton et c'est de ça que j'aimerais vous parler.

Vous avez très bien identifié les problèmes qui existent au Nouveau-Brunswick en relation avec les déchets toxiques, l'entreposage, la location, le transport, les problèmes avec les déchets municipaux et les déchets industriels. La façon que je vois les choses c'est qu'à un moment donné, l'industrie d'une part et le public d'autre part ne savent pas vraiment à qui s'adresser quand ils ont des problèmes de déchets toxiques... non seulement l'entreposage mais la façon de s'en débarasser. Il y a évidemment Environnement Nouveau-Brunswick qui est là qui fait son travail, il y a aussi des laboratoires privés mais lorsqu'on vient à poser des questions plus précises à savoir qu'est-ce qu'on doit faire avec ces choses-là, les gens c'est-à-dire la population en général n'a pas tendance à croire les interventions de ces organismes. Pas parce ce qu'ils ne sont pas bons c'est juste parce ce que la population préférerait avoir une opinion indépendante. C'est une question de confiance, voyez-vous?

Alors, nous pensons que la création d'un organisme indépendant, ce que je mentionnais tantôt, un centre de recherches, par exemple, en sciences environnementales pourrait aider à solutionner le problème.

Alors, je n'ai pas de solutions immédiates au problème des déchets toxiques. J'ai seulement à vous faire une suggestion qui pourrait éventuellement régler le problème des déchets toxiques et c'est celui de créer, justemment au Nouveau-Brunswick, un centre de recherches en sciences environnementales qui commencerait par se doter d'une infrastructure et ensuite pourrait "tackle" comme on dit en anglais, attaquer les problèmes que vous avez mentionnés, problème d'entreposage, etc, etc.

Alors, je vais juste, je vais être assez court, je vais vous donner en quelques mots les objectifs de ce centre et ensuite je vais vous laisser avec ça et en vous disant ceci, que l'objectif principal de ce centre serait de développer et supporter des groupes de travail qui feraient des recherches fondamentales et appliquées dans des domaines reliés en environnement. Des recherches orientées vers les problèmes et les besoins régionaux dont se préoccupe principalement la population au Nouveau-Brunswick.

Les problèmes pourraient impliquer des contaminants chimiques, nécessitant des études d'impact, mais aussi des études écologiques impliquant les forêts, par exemple, aussi des études biochimiques, l'organisme marin, des études sur des engrais chimiques utilisés en agriculture, des études sur la composition chimique des minérais et autres ressources naturelles.

Alors vous voyez, on voudrait créer un centre de recherches qui aurait comme mandat principal, d'une façon indépendante, d'attaquer les problèmes qui sont réliés à l'environnement au Nouveau-Brunswick. Eventuellement ce centre deviendrait un centre d'expertise au Nouveau-Brunswick pour les problèmes environnementaux, ce qui n'existe pas actuellement. L'expertise n'existe pas actuellement. Si elle existe, elle est distribuée un peu partout dans la Province.

Alors, on se propose de créer un centre et de développer une expertise pour attaquer les problèmes de l'environnement. Alors, la création d'un centre de recherches en sciences environnementales est un document qu'on a sur papier maintenant, et qu'on se propose d'envoyer au Conseil des gouverneurs de l'Université, pour discussions, éventuellement.

I'd like to say a few words in English for those who may have not understood what I said. In resumé, in short, I'm not coming here to suggest that I have solutions to all the problems, all the environmental problems that we have in New Brunswick at the moment, particularly with regards to organic wastes or other municipal or industrial wastes, but I'm here to suggest to you that we may eventually find the solutions to those problems by creating an independent body. What I have called a Centre for Environmental Sciences that would deal specifically with environmental problems.

This centre, we recommend that it would, it should be situated, it could be situated or located at the University of Moncton. Principally because of the central location of Moncton, for one thing and also because of the University or the campus here. This would be a centre that would be independent of, on the one hand, government pressures and on the other hand public or industrial pressures and they could come out with independent answers on specific problems such as what do you with toxic wastes and what do you do with other wastes that are not toxic but are so large or volumunus that they create a problem. I'm thinking for example of the crab and lobster carcasses which are dumped in the Province and create quite a smell.

So, I'd like to propose to you that it would be a good idea to create such a centre in Moncton, of course, in New Brunswick, on this campus and I solicit from you some support for this. We are going to go ahead anyway about the centre. We're going to propose this to the University. They may or may not accept it but it would certainly help if there was some backup from a prestigious body such as yours. Thank you very much.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much. Merci. Pourrais-tu t'identifier parce qu'au début tu ne l'a pas fait... tout simplement pour le...

MALLET:

That was the first thing I meant to do, de m'identifier. Je suis le professeur Victorin Mallet, professeur de chimie au department de chimie, biochimie, de l'Université de Moncton et je suis ici spécifiquement à titre de coordonnateur d'un groupe de recherches en sciences environnementales.

LAPIERRE:

Bien. Si ça ne vous dérange pas de demeurer là quelques minutes, on aurait quelques questions à vous poser. Dave?

KERR:

Yes Sir, you made the statement in your preamble to your talk in French that industry does not really know what to do with toxic wastes and how to handle them. I can assure you that we know precisely what to do and how to handle them because there are laws both directed from Environment New Brunswick and from the Environmental Protection Service of Environment Canada. We in the industry know precisely where to put them, and what to do with them and to suggest that we don't is not correct.

MALLET:

I understand what you are saying. That wasn't the intent there. It wasn't the intent on my part to put the blame on the industry for the waste problems. I meant this in the sense that when the industry has a problem, because there are, the industry sometimes has problem with wastes. Of course they know where to put them and so on but sometimes they have problems with wastes. They don't know what to do with them.

Or they don't know what to do when they have a waste problem situation where there are rivers contaminated or lakes contaminated or even seawater contaminated. Then, they don't know where to address the problem. Whether it goes out of the Province directly or to go to private labs for analysis for example?

KERR:

I think this is your opinion sir.

MALLET:

OK. Well, the point was the we could help if there was any problem in that sense.

KERR:

Yes, setting up an environmental research centre is a very commendable idea and I'm all in favour of it but I think you have to, industry has lived with toxic wastes and made many, many mistakes with it over the years, but in 1986 I think we know what the problem is and we're bound by the laws of Canada and of New Brunswick to handle these wastes.

MALLET:

I agree.

LANGMAID:

Where do you expect the funding to come from in these tight times. From industry, from the government or where?

MALLET:

Funding for a centre, what we're looking for is seed money to

build up the infrastructure, alors en français c'est pour créer l'infrastructure. But don't go back to them yes. I would suspect, what we need is some seed money to create the infrastructure to build up the expertise. Now where would the money come from? Of course we would expect the University to give us some backup, we would expect the public sector to give us some backup, we would also expect the municipal and provincial governments to give us some backup. In particular, Environment New Brunswick.

LANGMAID:

What figures are you figuring on there? How many millions to start off with?

MALLET:

Maybe I should not answer that question. I can tell you $50,000 a year for three years and it wouldn't mean very much and I could tell you $50,000,000 for three years and it wouldn't mean very much. We have to, what I suggest is that if there is some support we'll come up with a plan and some figures. We have some figures in mind of course.

LANGMAID:

I'm thinking just a ballpark figure. Are we talking $100,000 or half a million or...

MALLET:

Oh, we're certainly below the million but we're above the $100,000.

LAPIERRE:

Professeur Mallet, est-ce que vous pourriez nous donner quelques commentaires au sujet du, vous êtes chimiste, vous avez indiqué que vous êtes chimiste..professeur de chimie, est-ce que vous pourriez nous indiquer quelles sont vos idées sur le transport des déchets toxiques sur nos routes. Est-ce que, pour vous c'est essentiel ou c'est pas important qu'on connaisse qu'est-ce qui voyage sur les routes et est-ce qu'on devrait, par exemple, avoir une carte de route assez fidèle de tout ca qui voyage et même établir des routes...

MALLET:

Oui, très précisément, je pense qu'en ce qui concerne les déchets toxiques il faut savoir où on les transporte, qui les transporte, comment ils sont transportés. Parce que s'il y avait des problèmes à ce moment-là, pour des raisons de sécurité, on pourrait plus facilement les régler. Si on savait que les camions, par exemple, parce ce que je ne vois pas d'autres moyens de transporter des produits chimiques que par camions, pour l'instant, on peut pas les transporter par avion.

Et si on parle du Nouveau-Brunswick, je pense qu'on doit les transporter par camion ou peut- être par bateau si l'occasion se présentait, surtout le long des côtes du Nouveau-Brunswick. Mais peu importe, lorsqu'on transporte des produits chimiques, il y a des dangers. Mais on n'a pas le choix. Il faut les transporter. On ne peut pas les laisser là. Donc il faut utiliser des moyens de transport qui existent. Donc il faudrait certainement connaître les endroits où on transporte ces produits chimiques, qui les transporte, et comment on les transporte.

Mais je ne suis pas certain, personnellement, qu'on devrait transporter nos déchets chimiques en dehors du Nouveau-Brunswick. Je ne pense pas qu'on devrait déposer nos déchets toxiques dans la cour d'en arrière des autres provinces. Ce n'est pas la solution et éventuellement ils vont nous demander de les garder nos déchets toxiques. Alors, il faut trouver nos solutions à nos problèmes.

LAPIERRE:

Comme citoyen du Nouveau-Brunswick, êtes-vous en faveur? Si vous n'êtes pas en faveur que les produits voyagent à l'extérieur de la Province on parle des produit dangereux, est-ce que vous seriez en faveur d'une dépense, par exemple, d'un incinérateur à haute température pour la destruction des produits dangereux à l'intérieur de la Province. Vous savez, sans doute, qu'un tel incinérateur coûte... le coût est assez élévé, et plus de ça c'est qu'au Nouveau-Brunswick avec, si vous regardez la liste des produits vous verriez que l'incinérateur probablement ne fonctionnerait pas à l'année.

MALLET:

Je pense que peut-être là, il faudrait considérer les autres provinces de l'Atlantique, par exemple, qui sont centrales ou près de nous, et essayer de régler le problème ensemble parce ce que, c'est vrai le problème que l'on a est un problème de... relativement le petit nombre de produits toxiques qu'on a à comparer disons avec l'Ontario ou le Québec ou les Etats-Unis. Mais, si on se compare comme quatre provinces qui ont des problèmes peut-être qu'un incinérateur pour les quatres province de l'Atlantique serait, au moins les trois provinces Maritimes, serait adéquat. Le coût? Sans aucun doute, il faut payer le prix de la pollution.

LAPIERRE:

Alors, vous comme citoyen, vous êtes prêt à payer ce prix-là.

MALLET:

Absolument. Pas personnellement.

LAPIERRE:

Non, non, mais comme citoyen. D'accord. Comme citoyen, c'est un problème collectif de la société. Alors, on vous remercie Professeur Mallet. Peut-être que plus tard on aura des questions à vous poser de nouveau.

Il y avait une deuxième intervention, M. Lakshminarayana....

LAKSHMINARAYANA:

Mr. President and members of the Council, my name is Lakshminarayana. I'm a professor of Biology at the University of Moncton. I'm here today, first as a taxpayer, second as a concerned teacher, third as a person who is interested in the welfare of the environment in the Province. I didn't have time to prepare a submission in writing. I saw only three days back this advertisement in the newspaper at which time I did try to find out whether you'll accept some oral submission because I have been waiting for an opportunity like this from the Province so that we could talk to each other about mutually interesting things. If this is acceptable to you, I'd like to go ahead with my presentation.

Number one, I have been in this country since 1970. I read in your few minutes time that your Council has been created in 1971. It took you 14 years to come here to have public audience.

Second thing...I'm just stating some facts. New Brunswick when I came here, when I enquired from the various departments where public (tape inaudible) work is done or water treatment and wastewater treatment is done, I did find out of the Atlantic provinces it was the New Brunswick province which has done quite a bit of work compared to the other provinces. However, during the past 14 years, I have been observing several things happening.

For example, I want to be more controversial today, I want to raise some questions, not only from Mr. Dave Kerr and Don Smith who are professional engineers and also from other government officials who are present here because it concerns everyone about when you hear things as what they are happening should not happen in this province.

Number one, I'll give you an example about the recent Renous incident and the concerned citizens come and say you cannot have it here, you cannot put the storage arrangements which could have served and saved quite a bit of cost for the Province. It was taken back by the Province and the Province said they are not going to put the toxic wastes and the asbestos in that area. But, if there could have been proper and positive approach to the people, probably things could have been different for having, to have a proper understanding. For example, the same asbestos is sitting in the centre of the city. Nothing has happened and when a few demonstrations were there near practically not that much populated area the government has decided to stop it. Now the question is, or the example is. The question is where is the courage? What are these political decisions? The Province and mother nature has to conduct itself or herself through the political decisions all the time? Or do we have to depend on our technology and scientific development?

Second example I'll give you. Fish treatment plants in the Caraquet area and there are to my knowledge at least two or three fish treatment plants. In 1970 and 1971 at that time there were not even screens for the solids to be separated. I know that the Province has insisted that they should have screens to separate the solids but however, the way the things conducted it did help in increasing the silting in that area and also the accumulation of organic matter.

For your information, people who are living in Shediac and near about area where we have a National industry, still people who live in the cottages are complaining for the past two years about being thrown big solid chunks from the National Sea Products. In spite of inspections, no solution has been found for the people of that region. There is something wrong which is not acceptable to anybody neither to the Province nor to the people.

There is another example, the spruce budworm spray. I've been involved with EMOFICO. I have seen things that were happening, happening with the targeted and non-targeted organisms that is such. That is such is conducted within two to three months time all the time and spraying is continuing. Since when? Since 1950.

How many millions of dollars have been spent? Are we justified when we could not find for so many years any proper solution to the problem still by saying that we are getting the, importing the technology from outside.

These are a few examples I have given. I am not saying that I have all the solutions but at the same time I would like to say to Mr. Ken Langmaid about the money. I'll tell you where the money is. It is improper managing. For example, you take nowadays there are so many consulting firms. Some of them are so-called consulting firms. People who are not qualified are there, they design plans and most of the time the tenders are selected for commercial treatment plants and most of the time the communities are given only the primary treatment. Where it is supposed to be only 50% (tape inaudible) for Moncton since 1970 they wanted to have a treatment plant. What did we end up after 14 years, the primary treatment still the collectors are going underground whereas our distribution systems for the pipes are leaking and rotted. The Province has to find millions of dollars to replace those pipes.

But when there are alternative solutions available, why should they not make use of it. Why should they not invest in our future through our young people. For example, my friend Dr. Victorin Mallet. I didn't know that he was submitting a submission today because I never talked to anybody. But however, this Province gives money to the Universities to educate their people. I have been here for the past 14 years. I have yet to see a project that is being collaborated and developed for a solution along with the Province and the University of Moncton.

We have not been taking advantage of the people that are available and could develop technology and pay our own students. students are the cheap labour. You don't have to give $50,000 for a small solution to the consulting firm. You could have the same for $5,000 by employing the student and the free advice from the professors. This is not being utilized by this Province.

Education and training which could happen there, the present education standards are such that the Province when it is conducting its policies, I do not know to what extent the consultations go but it is to my knowledge today I have seen the Annual Report here that was given and I find that the treatment plants are, for example here on page, this is Environment New Brunswick Annual Report, on page 7. The percentage of plants that were in compliance with provincial wastewater standards are VOD, suspended solids, TK and activated sludge. It was given 81.

I did not know what it meant by 81. You've got 81 says as the permissible limit. By our Commission standards, 81 is far fetched. Even with this filter. Even if it is not filter. Lagoons. It shows not a single lagoon is functioning in the Province. And what are the solutions that are given here? There are given certificates for people to give them more initiative to maintain their plants.

Second thing is that having the course for operators. They are dandy. But how is that when the treatment plants are not functioning? Proper steps were not taken. I myself no I would not want to name the (tape inaudible) and the regions. I agree with it once in a while with the my students for courses and I did find I could name half a dozen treatment plants which have not been functioning for the past six years. So, where is it that is lacking? The problem is most of the time the solution are taken from standard methods of approach of having commercial treatment or something which might be applicable without being proper experimentation. I suggest very endlessly to this Province that they should encourage the consulting firms as are the Universities are at one place, to have some pilot plants. Some areas where they could experiment and then put that in the solution instead of importing technology which is not going to function in our environment.

Second thing is, I was flabbergasted in this pamphlet a solution was given is that rinse it three times, puncture it and put it in the ground. What is this? So, what I am saying is before we distribute such things to people, what I suggest is that we must have more rapport with the people. We must have more educational programs. We must publicize what we are doing. (Tape inaudible) and ask the newspaper to publish. There are many ways to do from public...to bring the public's viewpoint. Let us work together with the people who are concerned with this. And it is possible to develop. For example, incineration that is being talked at least 50 times from the time I entered this room. Do you know, last year an incinerating plant has been completed in Prince Edward Island? Why not all the provinces near about could use that incineration plant? Why not the fish treatment plants in Caraquet area or the Shippagan peninsula have one treatment plant? Which saves quite a bit of cost. So there are many ways to look into, if you like to, put it in your mind, there are many ways where we could sell many and also have very good economic treatment of our natural waste.

Third thing is we have three natural resources. We have fishery, forest and agriculture. Fishery, we talk, but we don't talk of water. For example, I'll show you end of conflict. A very nice study was done by (tape inaudible) from the Province regarding the existence of infiltration from sea into the coastal areas and deterioration of water quality because of silting infiltration. But at the same time, we had another campus in Shippagan where we have now a good nice institute to do, how to support the peat moss. But however, is there any talk given, I do not know if it is given, please forgive me, I am very happy to hear that, that any talk was given to what extent we could exploit this natural resource which is acting as a natural filter to reduce pollution both from the sea as from the land.

So, with this talks I would like to request you to consider the implication of the University and students to work hand in hand with the Province for developing solutions and trying them. At the same time make use of them and at the same time have much more implication or involvement with the public.

Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

I wonder if you care to stay there for a moment please? Just a comment from myself before I move on to a couple of other comments.

One of them is that you mentioned a rapport with the people. Hopefully, the Council, an evening like this evening could be seen as a rapport with the people. So if Council hasn't done all its meeting with the people in the past at least you must agree that this is a start.

I would also like to say that we did have a public meeting in Moncton. You mentioned that we hadn't met since our inception, since 1971. We have on one other occasion met in Moncton. We did not have a big turn out but we did meet.

I would like to have, there's a comment from Mr. Dave Kerr, but I would like to know if either Dave Silliphant or someone from the Environment could comment regarding the comments by Professor Lakshminarayana with the fish processing plants along the coast, the requirements for filtering or whatever is required in dumping wastes, organic wastes, into the water. But first of all, I'd ask Mr. Kerr to state his comment.

KERR:

Yes, I just have a few comments about spraying for the spruce budworm. Whether we like it or not, the economy of this Province is driven by pulp and paper and forestry. There's no question of that. There's ten pulp and paper mills in the Province and dozens of saw mills. And they bring in more income than mining, agriculture, fisheries and tourism combined. And we cannot afford to lose our softwood forest, as has happened in Nova Scotia. If you go to the highlands of Cape Breton, the forest is gone. It's completely dead and gone and it's all jackstraw... now they can't even recover the dead wood. This is what would happen if we stopped spraying for the budworm. None of us like spraying for budworm. We've been doing it as you say, since 1950 and millions and millions of dollars have been spent on it. But it has indeed kept the infestation to a level where the trees are growing and can sustain the mills that sustain the economy of our Province. We don't want to spray but up until now there's been no other way to keep this forest in place. Any of you who have seen Cape Breton knows what I say is true. The forest is gone from the Highlands of Cape Breton. And that's what would happen here in New Brunswick. We don't know any other way to keep the insect down other than to spray. It's as simple as that.

LAPIERRE:

I would ask Dave or is Dave going to answer? Yes?

SILLIPHANT:

Mr. Chairman, you asked specifically about the fish processing wastes?

LAPIERRE:

Yes, that was one of the comments in the previous speakers...

SILLIPHANT:

The national guidelines for fish processing, in the industry is to put I think 25 mesh or 20 mesh screening with an outflow to low water. I think that in all cases these facilities are installed, but the professor is quite correct that we do have operational problems, the screen's blind, larger solids get through and there are times during the summer when this is a real problem particularly in the Shediac area where there's heavy recreational use.

The other thing I would like to say is that I do believe there is a misconception about the Province deciding to take the asbestos to Renous and then changing its mind. I'd like to correct that. I understand one of the purposes we're having this exercise this evening is to try to find out from the people what we should be doing with the asbestos. It was not us, it was the Federal Government.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you. And this is one question I'd like to come back to Professor Lakshminarayana. You mentioned about asbestos that's downtown and I was going to bring the same remark but Dave did, it was a federal decision not to store. The barrels are sitting downtown now. What do you suggest should be done with those barrels. You mentioned you arrived here as a citizen, as a taxpayer... What are your opinions on these barrels? Where should they go?

LAKSHMINARAYANA:

I'd like to take right from your first comment. I'm sorry, I apologize, I didn't know about that meeting which the Council held. And I never meant that you were going to take it literally, when I said public consultation, it is not only the Council. Through the Council, the various arms of the Department of Environment and the government of New Brunswick, that is what I mean.

Second thing was regarding the spraying program and paper mills. I don't want to be picky, I don't want to enter into discussion about the merits and demerits of spraying and the quality of wood and type of treatment. I know something about it. But this is not the place to enter into a discussion. Since you've raised the point, pages 4,5,6, you've got several industries involved and the quality of their plants are judged by beauty. This beauty for (tape inaudible) sulfate process, as long as the lignins and celluloses are there, beauty is nothing. Your quality indication is not correct. It should be based on the (tape inaudible)

So, anyway I don't want to go into the merits and demerits, when I gave the example about the spraying program, what I meant was I do in my heart appreciate the efforts of the New Brunswick government in spraying and trying to preserve the forests. But however, I do in my heart have the affect of it has gone through to affect the other organisms in the ecosystem and at the same time the amount of money which you spent until now and what is it we have achieved completely? It is not only the case of helplessness but there are several ways of looking at things and the solutions, I will talk, but we have a group in the Province which is EMOFICO which I have been doing water work, but it is possible under the present circumstances.

What I am saying is ... it is possible to find solutions in mother nature when people were not living, when there were things were happening. There is a process called in water, sulfurification. In nature it is called self adjustment and evolution. It does take place. That is why (tape inaudible) there could be some other solution for that. I don't mean to say that the Province should not have spent at that time, these are all political decisions. As far as I am concerned, there are several millions of dollars that have been spent on this. Still we don't have a solution that is acceptable to everybody. That was why, that was a (tape inaudible) case of example I gave.

The third one was regarding the decisions of the federal government or the provincial government or whoever it may be. The Province says that (tape inaudible) research support to the federal government does. The Province doesn't do any research. They may do something but monitoring, or even the quality, this is the general reply we get. And it is high time for the Province to invest some money in research, at the same time develop technology and train their own people which are different from federal, depending on federal departments.

Today we have asbestos sitting right in the centre of the city. If it was on the roofing of the wall where there is certain mixture, the asbestos was falling down, just as in a mine where we have open pit mining where it is entering into the human system. It is as good as keeping it in the drums as good as staying in the walls as far as I am concerned. It could be kept at a place acceptable to all people, after consultation. As far as I am concerned, Renous is as good a place as any other where these dumps could have been kept. This is my personal feeling. So, what I am saying is here where we lost a good opportunity was the people whoever is responsible whether the provincial or federal or some other agency or public works department, whoever it may be, there was an oversight in not properly consulting the people. That is my part. Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

I wonder if ah....do we have any further, yes sir?

BEUKEVELD:

Mr. Chairman, my name is Bernard Beukeveld and I am a spokesperson for the Moncton and District Labour Council, Health and Safety Committee. As I was sitting down and making some notes and I'm not as learned as the two previous speakers, so you'll have to bear with me but I'll do my best, even though my boots are shaking.

You mentioned, a moment ago in your opening remarks about hazardous products need to be stored. Well, firstly, we take violent exceptions to that because that's not the answer. They have to be neutralized. They have to be solidified. And they have to be disposed of properly. And the storage of any hazardous product is not the answer.

Toxic wastes in the future, you mentioned. Well, Mr. Chairman, the toxic wastes came into the environment by our engineering process and by business and that business for the future should have to change their philosophy or their outlook and start thinking about not trying to beat somebody to a better mousetrap but ask themselves the moral question is ...Can we afford, as a society, to bring this particular product into our environment? With that, I mean, can we play God in bringing all these wonderful molecules together and then don't know what to do with them after my wife or your wife or the factory is done with them?

Right now, I am...some of the literature that I come across, and I'm not saying I'm a learned person, which I am not, but we do know we have over 4 or 5 million products around this nation of ours and maybe 30,000 of them have been checked out of what they will do to you, my kids and my grandchildren. And the rest of them fall by the wayside and industry will put them in the marketplace to beat a path to that other mousetrap that industry is forever chasing.

And I have to take, and I will stay behind the mike, I'm going to take a swipe at Mr. Kerr and Mr. Smith there at the head table that I stay to Mr. Kerr and Mr. Smith that industry does not know how to handle the products that they are working with. They do not know how to dispose with them because the papers, not only the local ones which is sort of a closed shop from the Irving enterprises, but I do know, I let my friends know I read the Globe and Mail. And we do read time and time again of horrible stories... like just today we had a sulfuric acid spill in northern Ontario and in today's technology for the people that didn't read the Globe and Mail, they got to that site on a snowmobile. Is that the way we're going to look after the products that we have in our environment, Mr. Chairman? Is that how we combat the forces of nature? When it comes to the forces of nature, Mr. Chairman, we puny little beings as we are, we have no power whatsoever.

There was an oil spill on the oceans, I think it was on the North Sea, 100 foot waves, how would a boom contain a well that has gone array? We haven't got the technology. Vinyltoluene, benzene, PCB's, amahines, nitrosamines. The Texaco Corporation, my background as being a mechanic and some of you people entrust your life with me to put that cotter pin on that front wheel when you have some brake work done. The Texaco Company saw fit to put it on their oil cans that this oil can cause cancer. We're going to have to ask ourselves, do we need all these products in our environment?

And another thing I say Mr. Chairman is the companies put out millions of dollars for research, let them tack a few more cents on that product and let the marketplace determine if those products are going to be sold depending on the price and have that cost incorporated into the disposal of that product. From the cradle to the grave manifesto. We cannot keep continuing bringing those wonderful tens of thousands of products into an environment to help your and my life to be a little simpler and our great and great grandchildren going to be affected by it. And we might have to get ourselves a little shock. Do we want some more babies that have no legs or no arms? Or what other horrible disfigurements we're going to have down the road? And maybe some people might think I'm knocking the free enterprise, but I'm not. Because free enterprise has served us well over the years. But the free enterprise is going to have to pull themselves back on track and are going to have to put themselves into a responsible stewardship in regard to the profit motive, in regard to the responsibilities we have to our other people in society.

You mention most of transport, I want to touch on that a moment also. Yes, there should be designated routes. Yes it might be better to have it done at night because of less people on the road, but let's be careful.

When we transport dangerous commodities, when we designate a time slot that is under the cover of darkness we want to make sure the regulations are in place and the regulatory body is given the manpower to enforce those regulations. Because to have the regulations on the book, Mr. Chairman, is all well and good, but unless the monies, unless the funding has been forthcoming to keep track of those movements under the cover of darkness, you may as well just leave that page blank.

Well, I'm going to stand here and I'm ready for whatever entourage I've had my say and now you folks have your say.

LAPIERRE:

Well, thanks a lot. It's discussions like yours that we're looking for and wish to thank you for having the courage to come forth and saying it. There's just one thing, I just have one comment. I'd like to just clarify with you. It is that you'd be willing, as I understand, to have an environmental cost built into the production of anything that we produce?

BEUKEVELD:

Certainly. And let the marketplace determine if that product will be sold.

LAPIERRE:

You mention the transportation of hazardous goods. I could also understand that you'd be in favor of a manifest system where everything that travels on the road is registered and ...

BEUKEVELD:

Mr. Chairman, right now we have horror stories, even in the Province, galore. We have trucks coming in from out of the province with perchloroethylene in them, not a marking on them. The scale operators that are on the border of the Province don't know what's on them. There are just, lets say, 600 gallon tanks, four or five within a truck body all uncovered. And not a marking on them, from out of the Province. And industries are using them, they're bringing them products in the Province. Another thing, while I'm on this, is that I have no qualms with shipping the wastes to a particular site somewhere out of the Province because most of these dangerous commodities that we're utilizing in the Province are not manufactured here anyway.

LAPIERRE:

There's another comment I'd like to come back to. One of your first comments was that you said that you were against storage in the Province. I think I'd like to ask you a question and maybe clarify my comment. My comment was that the dangerous chemicals would be stored until such time as they would be shipped out for incineration to another Province. Because it would be difficult with the quantities that we generate to have this shipped daily. You would have to have some holding time. And this is what I meant by holding.

And the other question I'd like to ask of you is what do you consider or how do you see the setting up of these controlled waste sites in the Province? Do you think we need to control wastes, for example, such as asbestos?. As you know now, no one wants it. Sending asbestos away out of the Province might be quite difficult. Do you think that asbestos could not be stored within these controlled waste sites?

BEUKEVELD:

Well, this controlled waste site, some of the material I have looked over they don't go into great definition of controlled waste sites. I had some discussion with some people that have had some experience working with asbestos and that were part of an asbestos removal team. I quizzed them on that. I said listen, what can we do with this particular product and just keeping in mind folks, we are just laymen, we are not experts. But, this is what this public hearing is all about and the remarks from these people were, and they are tradesmen, that it came out of the ground, bury it properly and it's the safest place to have it. OK, a person, you know might have...we don't know. This is what I mean. I have my house full of glass fiber. I've got 15 inches of fiberglass in my house. Maybe 15 years down the road, they're going to tell me, listen, you're going to have to take that out because it has proven to be carcinogenic. But, in the meantime, it came out of the ground, it was not hazardous when it was there, properly disposed of in an in-ground burial procedure, that seems to be the information I came away with, with talking to some of these people, and like I say they're laymen, but at the same time they have been trained to handle asbestos, I'm sure they have read a lot on it because it's certainly not a very pretty product to have around.

And just to jump on the bandwagon a moment, unless you're going to cut my mike off Mr. Chairman, is that the asbestos scare, ladies and gentlemen, did not come from industry. The asbestos scare came from the organized work force in the United States. The union that was working with asbestos did some research and they were looking at their members and they say my Goodness gracious, our members are just dropping off like flies. There is something here amiss. And just for the....so it's usually industry normally doesn't ring the alarm bell, because industry within the free enterprise philosophy is geared to profits, to build a better mousetrap, and to satisfy the shareholders. They are not concerned, a lot of industry is not concerned with your and my health. We are just a commodity to them to improve their productivity over a period of years.

LAPIERRE:

OK, well thank you. There's just one comment. I wonder if Mr. Lutes would care to give, or maybe Mr. Silliphant, on the controlled waste site. There was a question of...we don't know what these will entail. Or maybe Miss Godin. Just to give the people some idea of what a controlled waste site would entail.

LUTES:

I guess we don't know 100% ourselves as yet what types of waste will go to these controlled waste sites. The idea of controlled waste, having controlled waste sites, was born out of the fact that we couldn't get rid of asbestos in Minto and other areas of the Province. There are other types of waste that we felt were not hazardous waste according to the definition but still the municipalities didn't want them in their landfill sites. I can give you an example of a truck carrying acid that went off the road about a year ago on the St. George area. The acid was neutralized with lime and essentially we ended up with a fairly innocuous mixture. By the time it was neutralized and everything was mixed together and accumulated, we had about 25 or 30 truck loads. And we talked to maybe 10 or 12 municipalities, the Provincial Department of Transportation and nobody wanted it. It had a certain connotation because at one time it was an acid and everybody thought it was a hazardous waste. Another problem, they were afraid, I guess, it was going to, because there was 25 or 30 truck loads involved, it was going to fill up their landfill site and that's the type of waste that we're talking about that would be directed to the controlled waste facilities.

We call them orphan wastes or wastes that nobody wants but they are not hazardous wastes by definition and they are not the normal household residential type waste. Asbestos is another example, it's well documented that if you put asbestos in the ground and cover it properly so that no one gets access to it, the migration rate of asbestos fibers are something in the order of one or two centimeters every ten or twenty thousand years. But asbestos waste has the connotation of being hazardous waste and you know, nobody wants it in their backyard.

There's oily wastes, sludges, there's filter materials from beverage operations, diatomaceous earth, for instance, from brewing operations, water-based materials, certain latex sludges and there's kind of a wide range of materials.

Again I stress that they don't fall within the definition of hazardous waste and they're not residential waste and some of them are very innocuous but for one reason or another, municipalities will not accept them in their landfill sites because of the aura or the connotation that those wastes may have. And for that reason we are looking for between three and six fairly remote locations with proper soil conditions, proper hydrogeological conditions that we can put these wastes and hopefully if they are far enough away from people we're not going to have a backlash.

LAPIERRE:

You do have some guidelines for distances don't you, from habitation and waterway, where these sites would be located.

LUTES:

Essentially, in terms of distances we're looking for two to three kilometers away from any habitation and even beyond that within ten kilometer zone beyond the two to three kilometers, we would look very closely at the type of activity within that zone. And we're essentially looking for places in the boondocks and I might add we're going through a constraint mapping process where we eliminate all of the variables, all of the areas that we don't want to be in. We don't want to be near parks and housing developments, near lakes or streams and essentially trying to stay on Crown land as much as we possible can and we're having some difficulty finding sites that meet all the criteria.

The criteria are so stringent that the difficulty, we're having severe difficulties, I guess in meeting and finding three, four, five sites but the idea is to be remote, to hopefully to be within ten kilometers of any residents. Monitoring wells would be installed. The access to the site would be secure. They would be operated by the Provincial Department of the Environment and monitoring wells would be installed. It will be a user-pay type of operation. If a particular company has a waste, we will accompany that company's vehicle to the site, the waste would be disposed of within the matter of a day or two, the site would be secured and again monitoring wells would be provided for long-term monitoring.

LAPIERRE:

Thanks a lot Mr. Lutes.

TAYLOR:

Could I ask a question while you're still there please Mr. Lutes? I wondered how New Brunswick deals with an emergency when it comes to a spill or an accident and how prepared you are? Do you have people out around the Province or is there one force that goes to the site, etc.?

LUTES:

The first response is the individual having an accident notifies the Coast Guard Centre in Halifax. It's a Zenith, Zenith 49,000. They in turn have a list of telephone numbers of Provincial employees with not only our Department but other Departments as well. We have regional offices, six locations around the Province so there's usually not too much difficulty in getting an inspector to the scene of the accident within a matter of several hours. The individual from our Department, when he arrives, he's designated as a unseen Commander, so-called, and he is responsible for coordinating the clean-up of that spill material.

LAPIERRE:

Thanks a lot Mr. Lutes. Oui?

FERRON:

Bonjour, je suis Daniel Ferron. Je suis étudiant de biologie à l'Université de Moncton. J'aurais une question pour M. Kerr.

Tantôt, lorsque M. Mallet a présenté son projet de centre de recherches environnementales, il à dit que ce centre-là, servirait à essayer de trouver des moyens de se débarraser des déchets toxiques parce ce qu'il disait que l'industrie ne savait pas quoi faire à certain moments avec les déchets toxiques. M. Kerr a indiqué qu'il n'était pas d'accord puis que l'industrie savait parfaitement quoi faire avec les déchets toxiques. J'aimerais savoir qu'est-ce qu'ils font avec les déchets toxiques puis est-ce que s'ils font quelques choses, qu'est-ce qu'on fait ici à chercher une solution pour les déchets toxiques?

LAPIERRE:

Dave, did you get that question?

KERR:

Yes.

LAPIERRE:

Are you ready to answer?

KERR:

I'll give you an example. PCB's is a material that's in everyone's mind these days. All industries that have been in business more than ten years, have considerable quantities of PCB's in their transformers because up until about 10 or 12 years ago that's what was filled, that's the liquid that was put into transformers. Now, any transformer that is, the government allows you, the federal government and the provincial government allows you to continue to use a transformer with PCB's as the insulating fluid. Once that transformer is retired from service, it must be stored in an area of the plant with a dyke around it and posted with signs provided by the Environmental Protection Service of Environment Canada. Both the Provincial and the Federal environmental agencies must be informed when you take a transformer out of service, or retire it. If a transformer leaks for instance, that has PCB's in it, you must at once call Environment New Brunswick and the Environmental Protection Service of Environment Canada in Halifax and inform them of this.

They send up their inspectors to make sure that you remove all the earth or concrete or whatever that is contaminated with PCB's and that material goes to this storage area with the old transformers that is got a dyke around it.

And it will stay there until we can find someplace, hopefully in another province. We don't think it'll ever happen in New Brunswick, but some kind of a spot that will take this material and incinerate it. To get it there, it's got to travel either on the railways or on the public highways. And you see what, of course what happened up at Kenora. But to say that we don't know to handle these things, is in my opinion not correct. We are told how to handle them by both the Provincial and Federal governments. I can only speak, I work in the pulp and paper industry. I can only speak for them. I cannot speak for chemical companies that make things like perchloroethylene and other materials like that. But I assume that spills of that sort of material is handled in the same way we handle toxic wastes in our industry.

LAPIERRE:

Je voulais demander dans la même question puis après ça, j'ai une question pour M. Ferron, mais j'aimerais demander avant à Mademoiselle Godin, quel est, on a entendu récemment dans les nouvelles, les puits qui étaient contaminés par des produits spécifiques dans la région de Saint-Jean, des produits qui nous arrivaient de nettoyage à sec. Pourriez-vous nous indiquer comment, quelle est votre politique sur l'entreposage de ces produits? Et comment se fait-ils que ceux-là sont arrivés dans le milieu?

GODIN:

Et bien, comme on en a parlé déjà plusieurs fois ce soir, les déchets toxiques sont et dans l'industrie, et dans la petite entreprise et dans les maisons. L'industrie nous cause encore des problèmes, mais finalement sur l'industrie, c'est là où on a le plus grand contrôle, parce ce qu'on est au courant de ce qu'ils font, des déchets qu'ils produisent et on peut leur donner des lignes directrices à savoir comment traiter ou gérer ces déchets.

La petite entreprise est un petit peu plus dificile pour nous à contrôler parce que premièrement, elle est diverse puis on n'a pas tellement une bonne connaissance des petites entreprises avec leurs déchets et les différents genres de déchets qu'ils produisent.

Alors, la contamination qu'on vient de découvrir à Fairvale est le résultat de la mauvaise gestion de déchets d'une petite entreprise. Les nettoyeurs à sec qui ont déjà été identifiés comme étant une source possible de contamination produisent un déchet de pechloroethylene. Le perchloroethylene chez les nettoyeurs à sec est recyclé par les nettoyeurs à sec pour récupérer du solvent. C'est la seule manière qu'il peut rester en affaires, autrement il ferait banqueroute, parce ce qu'il serait tout le temps à acheter du nouveau solvent. L'efficacité de la récupération fait la différence dans le déchet et aussi la manière dont il dispose des déchets. Jusqu'à présent, au Nouveau-Brunswick, les déchets des nettoyeurs à sec s'acheminaient vers les dépôtoirs. Ca s'achemine encore aujourd'hui vers des dépôtoirs pendant qu'on est en train d'évaluer la meilleur manière d'établir des lignes directrices pour avoir un meilleur contrôle. Dans le cas de Fairvale, il y a eu entre autres, de l'entreposage de déchets tout proche de la propriété et la terre a été contaminée derrière l'édifice où se situait le nettoyeur à sec.

Alors, on peut supposer que la terre contaminée a résulté en la contamination des eaux souterraines.

LAPIERRE:

Puis actuellement, est-ce qu'on est en train d'éliminer la terre ou est-ce que c'est rendu dans la nappe phréatique ou, où est-ce que s'est rendu le produit?

GODIN:

La contamination est rendue dans la nappe phréatique. On est encore à évaluer l'étendue de la contamination. On a pris une soixantaine ou une centaine d'échantillons des différents puits dans la région pour établir comme je le disais, l'étendue où la contamination est-elle rendue et est-ce que la contamination voyage encore. Est-ce qu'elle se propage encore dans la nappe phréatique. On a pris les mesures qui sont à nos dispositions comme agence gouvernementale pour faire nettoyer l'endroit qui paraît être la source de la contamination. Maintenant nos pouvoirs sont quand même assez limités alors, ce qu'on a fait, on a donné ou émis un arrêté d'intervention qui a été servi au propriétaire du nettoyeur à sec. Dans l'arrêté d'intervention on a décrit ce qu'on voulait qui soit fait avec la terre contaminée. On a décrit comment on voulait que la nappe phréatique soit surveillée par le responsable de la contamination. Et on a aussi indiqué les mesures à prendre pour contenir la contamination dans la nappe phréatique afin qu'elle ne s'étende pas à des régions plus éloignées.

Les arrêtés d'intervention qui sont émis par le Ministère de l'Environnement sont émis par le Ministre de l'Environnement, puis dans le système légal on doit donner une certaine période de temps pour que physiquement il soit possible de répondre aux demandes du Ministre de l'Environnement. Alors, on est dans cette période d'attente où on a donné l'arrêté d'intervention avec les différentes directives à suivre puis on doit attendre soit que les mesures soient prises ou encore que la date à laquelle on a demandé que les différentes mesures soient prises soit passée pour passer la deuxième étape au point de vue légal.

LAPIERRE:

Merci. Alors, M. Ferron je crois ça vous donne deux exemples de produits qui sont dangereux et comment on les contrôle ou on essaye, vous pouvez en juger s'ls sont à votre satisfaction.

Une question que j'aimerais vous poser c'est que vous êtes étudiant à l'Université, vous avez indiqué que vous êtes étudiant. Je crois que, moi je suis convaincu que si on veut faire du progrès dans la sensibilisation du public au sujet des produits dangereux dans notre environnement et aussi pour rejoindre l'idée de notre monsieur de tantôt qui a fait un bon plaidoyer, est-ce qu'on a besoin de continuellement s'acheminer vers de nouveaux produits. Je vous demanderais deux questions. Premièrement au cours de votre séjour soit des écoles ou à l'Université, est-ce que certains de vos professeurs, par exemple, dans les cours de laboratoires, soit de biologie, de chimie, vous ont indiqué comment on doit déposer des produits chimiques que vous avez utilisés dans vos laboratoires? Quelle est la coutume normale que vous utilisez pour vous débarasser de produits chimiques? Puis, deuxièmement, comme étudiant est-ce que vous pensez que ... que pensez vous d'un site, par exemple, d'enfouissement de produits qu'on dirait de produits qui sont contrôlables à l'intérieur de la province? Etes-vous d'accord qu'on doit établir des sites? Parce ce que vous, vous êtes jeunes, la province, c'est votre province demain, nous on sera probablement disparu à moins qu'on trouve de nouveaux produits pour nous garder plus longtemps, mais en règle générale c'est qu'on va s'en aller bientôt et c'est vous qui serez probablement ici dans 20 ans et vous ferez peut-être la même chose que je fais ce soir. Alors, je vous demanderais vos commentaires sur ces deux questions?

FERRON:

Au sujet des informations comme dans les écoles et Universités je pense qu'aux écoles polyvalentes je me rappelle pas d'avoir eu vraiment affaire avec des choses dangereuses, des solvents organiques dangereux ou des chose comme ça. A l'Université je me rappelle dans les laboratoires qu'il y avait des endroits spécifiques où ce qu'il fallait surtout le laboratoire de chimie il y avait certains endroits ou ce qu'il fallait seulement sous une hotte ou quelque chose comme ça. S'il fallait travailler avec des déchets que... avec des vapeurs toxiques ou après qu'on avait utilisé des solvents organiques qui étaient dangereux il fallait les entreposer à la même place puis c'était rigoureusement utilisé par les responsables du laboratoire.

Pour la deuxième chose, les sites mais je pense qu'y en faut des sites puis je suis néobrunswickois puis de dire qu'on envoye ça au Québec, bien les Québecois il vont dire, bien pourquoi le Nouveau-Brunswick nous envoye ça, c'est notre territoire puis je pense que les sites ça se trouvent, si c'est nous autres qui les produit, ça serait à nous autres à trouver des sites. Peut-être sur notre territoire, mais des sites contrôlables ou qui seraient vraiment hors de portée des enfants ou quelqu'un qui pourrait aller jouer comme ....un site comme maitenant au centre ville à Moncton, où est-ce que les déchets sont entreposés, je pense c'est pas trop agréable de voir ça en arrière de chez soi. Par contre, c'est vrai dans l'environnement ça peut faire des dommages très importants mais comme je suis juste étudiant on est ici pour discuter de ça je pense, puis j'ai pas vraiment de...

LAPIERRE:

Y a-t-il des dépotoirs municipaux chez vous il doit y en avoir. Es-tu content de l'allure du dépotoir que tu as visité?

FERRON:

Non, pas trop. Les dépotoirs que j'ai visité une année ils creusent un trou une place, ils envoyent puis quand il est plein ils l'abrille de terre, puis là ils creusent à côté puis c'est de même, c'est une rotation. Puis, il y a toujours une grosse fumée qui s'élève de là puis c'est vraiment pas contrôlé. Il n'y a aucune clôture autour de ça, il y a aucun, c'est rare qu'il y a une personne là pour surveiller certaines affaires. J'ai même vu des enfants aller avec leurs parents puis se promener puis c'est vraiment un endroit dangereux les dépotoirs.

Puis je pense que l'idée des Commissions régionales c'est une très bonne idée de ce côté-là parce ce que il y aurait probablement du monde qui pourrait s'occuper des dépotoirs même si qu'un dépotoir, c'est un dépotoir, c'est nos déchets, mais il faut savoir quoi faire avec. Puis, c'est une bonne chose les Commissions parce ce qu'il y aurait de la surveillance de faite pour ces dépotoirs-là puis ce qui serait recyclable serait probablement recyclé je ne sais pas....

LAPIERRE:

Tu mentionnes le mot recyclage. C'est un mot qu'on entend peut-être pour la première fois ce soir. Mais quand on parle de déchets, c'est un mot que souvent on peut penser. Toi, comme jeune, qu'est-ce que tu penses du recyclage? Crois-tu qu'on en fait assez? Crois-tu qu'on pourrait en faire plus?

FERRON:

On pourrait en faire (tape inaudible)...quand on fait venir des bouteilles de l'état New York pour les travailler à Scoudouc ici au Nouveau-Brunswick, alors que nous autres on jette nos bouteilles de vitres à la poubelle. Ca serait un exemple qui serait pertinent à ce qui vient à dire du recyclage que ce sera utile d'en faire dans notre propre Province avant d'aller chercher des déchets des autres Provinces, des autres états ou quelques chose pour les travailler ici.

LAPIERRE:

OK, on te remercie Daniel. Oui, il y a une intervention en arrière. Oui?

GILCREST:

Mr. President, members of the Committe, I'm Shawn Gilcrest. I've just recently returned from Ontario where I graduated in biology. I think we're dealing with two issues here tonight and I don't think they have been properly delineated.

One is the management of toxic byproducts that are a result of industrial or other processes. The other is the management of the byproducts that have already been produced. And they are not the same problems. Regulating the amount of hazardous byproducts that come into the environment is a different issue from dealing with the ones that we have now.

I'm in agreement with previous speakers. I don't think it makes a hell of a lot of difference whether the asbestos is stored in the back yard of the Post Office or whether it's stored in Renous. It's not a solution to what is going to become of the asbestos. PCB's have been discussed tonight and there is no ultimate solution to destroying the toxicity of a PCB without incineration.

It's ridiculous to talk about a long-term project where PCB's are going to be transported into Ontario or Quebec for later incineration. As far as I am aware there's no incineration programs in Ontario or Québec at the time for PCB's. That's why the spill occurred in Ontario. PCB's were being transported to a dump in Manitoba.

So this is not a solution. I'm extremely pleased that you address the issue tonight as being one that concerns especially my generation. In fact it does. I think that a younger generation's view of the problem is going to be: one that we have to invest a lot of money into this problem and if that calls for putting money into an incinerator in New Brunswick then it's worth it. It certainly, Ontario is not going to take PCB's from New Brunswick for free. They're going to charge New Brunswick and New Brunswick industry is going to have to pay to dispose of them in one way or another.

Secondly, I don't think that the establishment of a research centre is necessary in the sense that I agree with the previous speaker that we know pretty well in 1986 what kinds of product we are dealing with and we know how to handle them. And I just want to propose to Mr. Langmaid that I'm a student that's only partially, very minimally employed right now and contrary to Professor Mallet's proposal to establish a research centre for $100,000 to under a million, there are people like myself who are qualified in biology, who know what we're dealing with and I offer my services free and all the Committee has to do is come up to me and say hey, we'd like you to do some research for us and it won't cost you anything.

LANGMAID:

I'm afraid we can't offer you a job, we'd like to. The incineration as I understand it, Québec and Ontario are building incinerators now and they have excess capacity. They would like our material up there to destroy, for a price, but it's cheaper for us to ship it up there and have them burn it, then spend 50 or 100 million dollars putting an incinerator in here.

GILCREST:

It may be cheaper but you're going to have to deal with public issues like Ontario has dealt with where a truck from Québec transporting PCB's to Manitoba and the spill occurred in Ontario. That's going to happen in the future. There's no way around it.

LANGMAID:

This of course, when you get into your regulations on transportation. That should be able to handle it, except for extreme cases of an accident.

GILCREST:

I don't think the regulations on transportation avoid accidents. They may control for where accidents occur, but they certainly can't prevent accidents. And that's what we're dealing with. We're dealing with extremely hazardous materials and any kind of accident where they are spilled into the environment is an uncontrolled situation.

LANGMAID:

This is quite true, but you're going to have to transport them at any rate in the Province here. There's going to be transportation to an extent.

GILCREST:

Certainly, and we have to minimize that.

LAPIERRE:

I understand quite correctly Shawn. You speak as the generation of tomorrow and what I can see is that you'd be willing to put the cost for whatever it is for taking care of waste products within a Province, up to incineration?

GILCREST:

I think that if you look realistically at the future, so far we're not controlling hazardous wastes, radioactive wastes. They are being produced at phenomenal rates every day, every year, and to suppose that we can dispose of them now without looking at long-term plans on how to deal with what we have and what we're putting into the environment is short-sighted and it's not concerned enough with dealing with the problem. Do you understand what I'm saying?

LAPIERRE:

I understand. I'd like to go back and ask you a question on solid waste. I understand you live in Moncton or around Moncton? You're aware of the landfill site that we have in Moncton? What are your comments on that site?

GILCREST:

I think as with anything in the environment, you have to have strict management and strict management costs a price. You have raw sewage being dumped into the Petitcodiac here in Moncton. There's absolutely no management in terms of what effects on the environment are going to be incurred down the future and that's not a Moncton problem, it's a universal problem right now. I think that any kind of a situation where you have absolutely no control as to what is being dumped into a place is simply beyond comprehension for this day and age of technology.

LAPIERRE:

OK, thank you. Yes sir? We'll take one more intervenor and then we'll take a short break. We have coffee and donuts next door. Don't go away, it's quite interesting. Come back, we'll take a 15 minute break or so. I have other people who have asked and there's four or five people, but I think around nine o'clock, we've been sitting down for two hours. We'll take a short break.

LAPIERRE:

Sir, go ahead.

H. LEBLANC:

Mr. President, members of the Committee, my name is Henry Leblanc. I'm retired. I'm from Cocagne. I'm a member of the Cocagne Environmental Committee. It doesn't mean a lot, Cocagne is very small, if you drive too fast on 11 you'll miss it completely. But, as a very small group last spring, I've heard people talking about just about everything here tonight, and I figure that I should have my five cents worth too.

We took action last June. We had a, I don't know why you call it landfill, ours we couldn't landfill it, it was a swamp. So, we called it a dump. That's what is was. It still is a dump. We had trucks coming from anywhere along 126 Highway up to the other side of Harcourt. We have had some from Saint John, from Sussex, from Moncton. They tried the asbestos deal, it didn't work because we stopped them.

Mr. Lutes is here and will verify what I'm saying. He was at a meeting with us here not too long ago. It took us seven months and a lot of hard work but we have finally mastered what we had started to do. We wanted control of our dump. We now have control of our dump. Our big problem was what was being thrown in there, hauled in by people that were supposedly emptying septic tanks, but they were emptying other things too. Somebody mentioned here a little while ago about doing test and more studies or whatever, to have a lab to do test and everything. We tried to get some tests done last summer from University of Moncton here. It was too involved. That's the answer that we got. They weren't prepared to do it.

Our main concern in Cocagne was our coastline, our shores. Where the tourists come in the summer, where they can eat oysters, clams or what have you. The studies, I think, have gone on long enough. I think action should be taken. We have a situation, where I come from, whereby the rivers are all contaminated and have all been condemned by the Provincial government. Anybody that has seen the maps provided by the Department of the Environment will see on the map that the rivers are all marked in red and they're all contaminated. There are signs everywhere that you are not to fish anything whatever. But this is Provincial.

But go to Shediac to the federal fishery department and buy a license and you can go fish all you want. Does that make sense to you? Or to anybody?

There seems to be a demarkation line, they put a series of posts, on that side it's poisoned but on this side it isn't. That doesn't make sense either. I don't know who did the studies on those things but I would say that he wasted his time. Or they wasted their time. And I think that the time for studies should be over, it's action that has to be taken. Nobody is doing anything. You can study it to death. You'll die and your grandchildren will still be studying. Do something. If we had been studying in Cocagne they would still be hauling garbage day and night like they were until the 15th of January. We stopped the whole thing right then. We put a man there, we put a gate that is locked. We have the full control of the keys and whatever comes in there that doesn't belong there, doesn't stay there. It's just as simple as that. We just put the foot down and laid down the law and that is it. And this is what has to be done with a lot of other things too, whether it's toxic or what.

If you want a good example of the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing. All these rivers that I mentioned to you, you can leave, not now because it's winter time, but in the summer time, you can go up any of those rivers and you can see the septic tanks running right into the river because these are cottage people. The law says that they are only there for a short time. They don't contaminate much. But you build a house, if you're a resident a permanent resident, you build a house and the government specifies that you have to have one acre of land, your soil has to be suitable for drainage. They send an inspector in and he pours a bucket of water in a hole to make sure that the drainage is good. But your neighbour, all he needs is an outhouse. No problem. Why? And we say the rivers are contaminated. We don't contaminate them. People from the cities or from New York or from wherever they're coming from that built cottages. They contaminate the river and what's done? Nothing.

A good example, again, of government's doing is the Cocagne dump. There's one river on this side fed by springs from the dump area, the Cocagne River. On the other side you have the Cocagne River that empties into Cocagne Bay. So what have you got? Contamination all the way through. But nothing is done about it. Now we have done something about it. And we intent to do more. And I think it's time to stop studying and it's time to take action.

Thank you very much.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you for your comments. I gather from your comments that local citizens have the dump in hand and these local citizens, as you indicated, are a dump committee. I wonder what your comments would be on a regional committee?

H. LEBLANC:

Well, I'll tell you what the answer was that we, in the letter that we wrote to the Minister. That was suggested to us. We don't want a regional committee. We have a committee. Our committee consists of the parish of Grand Digue, Notre Dame, Saint-Antoine, and Cocagne. It's not just Cocagne, there's four parishes. We have representatives from each plus the Cocagne committee.

LAPIERRE:

How do you fund your disposal at the moment?

H. LEBLANC:

We just told the Department of Transport we needed a man in there. And they put it in. They put the man in.

LAPIERRE:

You understand that shortly the Department of the Environment or the Department of Transport may not have....

H. LEBLANC:

We will accept those people with open arms, we want them, we feel we can deal with them. If we can't I think they'll learn to deal with us. The Department of Transport did.

LAPIERRE:

So you feel that people now understand the situation at the dump and that you can get people to dispose of their general household wastes in a decent way?

H. LEBLANC:

Oh yes, most certainly. But, until such time as we had the committee, the majority of the people sent their garbage to the dump, they don't even see the dump. Nobody realized what was happening there until we brought out the facts. They didn't know what was going on there. The general public doesn't know what's going on at the dump. We took it into our own hands to find out what was going on. It took us about a year to do a study. We didn't drag with it. Once it was completed, we had the facts, we took action. It's just a simple as that. And I would suggest to anybody else to do the same thing.

LAPIERRE:

I have just one final question. You had some people from away that were dumping their wastes such as, you say, sewerage or people...

H. LEBLANC:

Oh yes, we had household sewers.

LAPIERRE:

Did they give you any reaction when you told them they couldn't dump anymore?

H. LEBLANC:

Oh yes. They did. But they were made to understand by the Department of Health and by the Department of the Environment that this would cease and it did. It's just as simple as that.

LAPIERRE:

You wouldn't know where they've gone?

H. LEBLANC:

We don't particularly care where they've gone. The one man that we dealt with in Cocagne and in the area is a man from Sainte-Marie that handles most of the septic tanks in our area and what he did, he didn't put up any argument. He built his own lagoon and he told us, he said look, "any help that you need, I'm ready to help you". If there were more like him, there would be less problems.

LANGMAID:

Have I understood you right, you said it was located in a swamp.

H. LEBLANC:

Yes.

LANGMAID:

Who sited it? This is something that I am concerned with. Who picked out the site in such a place?

H. LEBLANC:

We wish we knew.

LANGMAID:

Because there's very strict...

H. LEBLANC:

Let's put it this way, there was a lot of politics involved in it. Somebody had land for sale that was worthless, and this is what happened. This is typical.

LANGMAID:

But there are very stringent regulations on what kind of soil you should have for a dump and the depth of it and the rest of it and these are in that area, do a good soil survey of it and that would be known.

H. LEBLANC:

Mr. Langmaid, let's put it this way. The first thing that we did, we obtained rules and regulations from the Environment as to what was expected of a dump, and if there's a place in North America where there shouldn't be a dump, Cocagne is the place. We didn't close the dump. We're controlling it.

LANGMAID:

Probably the best thing for that is to move the damn thing to someplace where it's suitable.

H. LEBLANC:

It will be with the time.

SMITH:

The Environment New Brunswick people, how does this, you have regional plans or regional facility plans, how does this tie in with... this sounds like a region to me. Is there any...

LUTES:

That's right. This would be one of our regions and the idea of the regional commissions is to collect waste from a fairly wide area. We're looking at 12 to 15 commissions in the Province, serving anywhere from 150,000 people down to as low as 15,000.

SMITH:

But you have a group here that's already made their own region. You're not going to tell them that part of their group is another region and all this sort of garbage are you?

LUTES:

That's something I wanted to question Mr. Leblanc on. The fact that we're looking at Cocagne as also being a commission site, he and the other members of his committee have done a very good job in getting control of the site. I think control is a proper word.

And I don't think that we, as regulators, or the Department of Transportation, as operators, of that site are particularly proud of the operation of that particular facility but I want to stress that having gotten control of it is maybe the first step. It may be an interim step. Eventually, we're looking at a regional site, a regional commission type site for that area and this gets into the aspect of economics and financing such a facility and I want to make it very clear to Mr. Leblanc that we, if that area is eventually converted to a landfill site, and to a proper landfill site, and it most probably would not be the Cocagne site.

SMITH:

The point that I'm after is that the, you're looking for a dozen or more groups around the Province to develop these regional waste sites and you have a very active group here. I'm hoping that you'll be making the best use of them as they stand. Is that right?

LUTES:

That's the intent. When we go into areas to form commission sites, we use the local representatives of the local service districts and the municipalities to form a committee and the government works along with the committee in forming a commission.

But I want to get a dig in here on the business of economics and it's a point that I made, I guess previously in Saint John, that the opposition that the Province is getting from a number of the municipalities that essentially everybody talks about, you know, we've got to do something better for solid waste management and everybody's in favor, it's motherhood. But our problem is, when we talk about dollars and cents to municipalities and of course we deal with the elected representatives and we assume that they're speaking on behalf of the people, the response we're getting from them is less than enthusiastic.

Some Councils are threatening to resign, other Councils... a lot of them making representations to our Minister that the costs are too onerous. That their people can't bear these costs, that the taxes are going to go up. We have the same problem with sewage treatment plants. We have public meetings occasionally when we want to establish a sewage treatment plant and we're talking $200 a year for user charge and you get a great hue and outcry.

I just want to make the point here that doing things properly, whether it's solid waste management or sewage treatment, costs money and today's technology, if you want to meet the proper standards, it costs big money. And the money is coming from the people. There is no, it is not us against the people, it's not government against the people. We're all in this thing together. The money comes from the same source. And it's got to be spent and spent properly and we're talking big dollars and in Henry's case we may be increasing the cost by a factor of five and the people have to realize that. I think as soon as we get over that hurdle..

SMITH:

My question though was simply that you won't let bureaucracy stand in the way of this group fitting in with your grand scheme?

LUTES:

No, the intent is not to let bureaucracy. The bureaucracy in the past has tried to go out and find sites and in some cases force the sites on the people. We're taking a different approach, one of the reasons we're here tonight, we've introduced Environmental Impact Assessment legislation to get into a more consultative process with the people. And that's precisely what we're attempting to do. The technical solutions are there. They've been there for years. We want to hear from the people now.

LAPIERRE:

Thanks a lot, Mr. Lutes and thanks a lot Mr. Leblanc. I guess we'll take a short break, 15 minutes or so and right next door here, there's coffee and juice and a rest break...

LAPIERRE:

We're back to listening, it's 9:30, we're prepared to listen to each and every one who has something to say. So there were a few people who had asked to speak before we broke off for coffee break. I'll honor these people and if anyone else wishes to speak, the only thing you have to do is raise your hands. So, I guess before we speak and I see she's just sitting down, I'd ask Madame Godin to just give us a short summary of how hazardous waste are transported on the highways at the present time?

What do we need to do and what is required of people that transport hazardous wastes? Can I just take a truck tomorrow morning and cart away PCB's and nothing is going to happen to me?

GODIN:

Well, Louis if you have PCB's and you have a truck, I guess you can. It doesn't mean you should or you could or there's no regulations stopping you but... there was a gentleman earlier who said that regulations don't stop the problem. Regulations give you an idea of how to control it but without the people to control it, the regulations are useless. That was a very good point.

Transportation of dangerous goods and transportation of hazardous wastes have been addressed by the Department of Transport and the Department of Environment in the last ten years, I think it was in the making, to get a regulation. The regulations started out at the federal level and it was under the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act. When the Department of the Environment realized what was going on we, at the federal level, decided to input into the development of the regulation to cover also the transportation of hazardous waste. The Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act and the regulations were proclaimed last year and they cover both goods and waste. Part of the regulations deal with the proper labelling of trucks and containers carrying dangerous goods and hazardous waste. Trucks carrying perchloroethylene should, by regulation, be labelled. And when they're not labelled, they're not in compliance with regulations but we can't catch them all. That's the sad part of it is that the regulation will not stop illegal transportation.

LAPIERRE:

What happens if you catch me with perchloroethylene for example?

GODIN:

As I said, the regulations were proclaimed a year ago July 1. The regulations dealing with labelling and so on. Because the regulations are like 300 pages, the book of regulations is a very cumbersome regulation, a difficult regulation to understand. The first year is an implementation period and the monitoring or the enforcement in the first year is mostly warnings, you're out of compliance with the regulation, this is what you should be doing and it's more of an educational process at this stage.

After the year implementation period is up and that varies with the various parts of the regulations as they are being implemented. When the year is up, then fines will be levied against the people who are out of compliance with the regulation. Now, as far as hazardous waste, there's a different twist to the regulation and that is in the manifest system which applies only to the transportation of hazardous wastes. And the manifest is a document which comprises three major parts, one to be filled out by the generator, one by the carrier, one by the receiver. So the generator identifies himself. He identifies the waste. He identifies the classification of the waste and the level of danger of that particular waste in that classification. The carrier, obviously, identifies himself, he identifies the license numbers of the vehicles which he is using for transportation. The receiver again identifies himself and fills out a part of the manifest where he makes sure that he is receiving the same material that was shipped and the same quantities of material that was shipped so he fills out again in his part, a description of the waste with quantities and volumes and so on.

The manifest is a six-page form, so that the generator must keep an original copy and send a copy of the manifest to the Provincial authority in the receiving Province. He must also send a copy to the Provincial authority in the originating Province. The receiver does the same. The receiver sends a copy of the manifest back to the generator so the generator is responsible to see that his waste has been received by the receiver within a certain period of time.

SMITH:

You're saying waste, but does that mean?

GODIN:

I'm saying waste, this is the manifest system...

SMITH:

What about acid or gasoline or...

GODIN:

Hazardous products...

SMITH:

Period or are you talking about waste here or are you talking about...

GODIN:

We're talking about waste.

SMITH:

Waste only?

GODIN:

Yes, products are regulated with a way bill, not a manifest. The difference in the paper work is that if you are shipping a product the receiver is paying for the product. If he doesn't get it, he's going to call you back and ask where is my product, whether it's a dangerous product or not. He's paying for a product, he wants it. If you're shipping a hazardous waste, you're paying the receiver, and the receiver never gets the waste. Well, he's got his money and the product is only going to cost him money to dispose of so he might not call the generator and say, "where's all this waste I'm supposed to dispose of"? The manifest will ensure that the receiver confirms that he has received the waste, he confirms that with both the generator, the provincial authority of the Province of origin and the province of destination.

So the manifest will give us a very good handle on what is travelling, where it's going, which industries are sending what and where. The manifest has to be carried with the load. The driver must have the manifest, the document with him when he is carrying the load. The inspection is carried out at various levels. There are some federal inspectors who have been appointed, both in the Department of Transport and the Department of the Environment. The transportation of hazardous waste is being manifested across the country as of now. If you have a waste that is going from one province to another.

The implementation of the manifest for hazardous waste inside the province is going to be done in New Brunswick when the Department of Transport, New Brunswick signs an agreement with Transport Canada to implement that regulation inside New Brunswick. That has not been done yet in New Brunswick.

So that the transportation of dangerous goods and hazardous waste is being manifested when it's leaving New Brunswick but there is no manifest required at this time for waste that are travelling within New Brunswick. Since we don't have a hazardous waste receiver, the wastes that are moving in New Brunswick are hopefully moving outside so they are being manifested. It's a little complicated. I don't know if you understood anything of what I just said but the manifest system is going to be a very good management tool also for the Department of the Environment to keep control on the volumes of waste that are leaving the Province.

Eventually, we'll have information on the volume of waste or better information on the volume of wastes that are produced by industrial sources or commercial sources, smaller industrial sources, and the manifest will permit us to check if in fact the various generators are shipping out wastes that we know they are producing.

LAPIERRE:

Do you have the authority to seize a truck that's not manifested that has hazardous waste but doesn't have a manifest?

GODIN:

I don't know if that authority lies with the Department of Transport or if would lie with us. As far as the implementation inside the Province, as I said, that agreement has not been signed with the federal government, so that it's not applicable in New Brunswick and that is essentially what has to be worked out, it's which provincial authority will take action when certain parts of the regulation are not complied with. I can't answer you on that one.

LAPIERRE:

OK, thank you.

BEUKEVELD:

Further to that question I'd like to just go into a little detail. If the originating product is from another province then the way I understand the regulation is that it comes under federal jurisdiction. If the starting point of that truck was in Nova Scotia, and you stopped that truck in New Brunswick, therefore you have inter-provincial transportation which automatically falls under federal jurisdiction.

LAPIERRE:

That's at the present time, but if there's a provincial manifest for the Province it might be different. At the present time there isn't a provincial manifest. So, I don't know how that's going to work when it comes out, but this was my question so I guess hopefully we'll....yes there's a few more people who have asked and there's a lady in the back, M. Mehra, and there's a gentleman in the front. The lady in the back and there's also, because some people have asked for a second turn, but I would like the people who have asked for just the first.....

BEUKEVELD:

I agree with Parliamentary procedure 100% Mr. Chairman.

LAPIERRE:

OK. Thank you.

CARON:

On ne devait pas s'attendre à avoir des femmes qui interviennent. Mon nom est Michelle Caron. J'interviens à titre de citoyenne de Moncton. J'aimerais d'abord avant de faire certains commentaires, j'aimerais poser une question à Madame Godin sur la grosseur des étiquettes qui doivent apparaître sur les véhicules qui vont transporter les déchets ou les matières dangereuses.

LAPIERRE:

Qu'est-ce qu'ils ressemblent, ces étiquettes-la, Madame? Est-ce que....

CARON:

Bien, je n'ai pas besoin de chiffres précis ...

LAPIERRE:

Non, non... Madame Godin?

CARON:

Je veux savoir si je suis en voiture puis je suis un camion, est-ce que je suis en mesure de savoir qu'est-ce qu'il y a dedans, je peux lire.

GODIN:

Déjà les camions, la majorité des camions sur la route ont des machins en plastique pour tenir les étiquettes, t'as dû les remarquer.

CARON:

Oh oui les p'tits trucs là, oui...

GODIN:

Oui. C'est à peu près dix pouces carrés je crois, l'étiquette puis c'est réglementé. La grandeur de l'étiquette est prescrite par la loi puis à savoir si tu peux savoir ce qu'il y a dans le camion, il y aura sur chaque étiquette un numéro de un à neuf qui indique la classification du déchet. C'est-à-dire que, un c'est des gazes, neuf c'est des déchets qui sont toxiques pour l'environnement. Entre ça, tu as des déchets corrosifs, tu as les inflamables, puis les réactifs, des choses de ce genre là. Aussi sur l'étiquette, tu vas avoir ordinairement un chiffre, le chiffre correspond à la classification des Nations Unies pour identifier les déchets. Le nom des déchets n'apparaît pas sur les étiquettes, premièrement parce ce qu'il n'y aurait pas de place sur les étiquettes ou encore qu'il y a des camions qui transportent des mélanges, tu aurais des camions tous couvert d'étiquettes. Mais, les étiquettes sont numerotés, il y a le numéro du produit ou un numéro qui indique un mélange de produits puis il y a aussi le numéro qui indique la classification qui peut te donner une idée peut-être sur ce que contient les camions.

CARON:

Merci. J'aimerais m'adresser d'abord à la question des transports. Je te demande encore qu'il faut effectivement qu'il y ait des routes qui sont designées, que ce soit le soir, je partage l'opinion de M. Beukeveld. Je trouve ça plus ou moins dangereux. Je peux comprendre les raisons au niveau de securité aussi à cause de la circulation. Sauf que je crains fort que sous le couvert de la nuit on nous en passe pas mal des petites vites là, donc je ferais bien attention à ça et je pense que ce qui est important là dedans, c'est qu'il y a des contrôles pour s'assurer que les camions c'est- à-dire qu'il y a des points de contrôle sur les routes, parce ce qu'il faut, c'est pas seulement partir de moment où il part, mais il faut que quelque part que ce soit des points de contrôle... que ce soit la police routière, les petites cabanes de pesée, ça je veux dire c'est aux fonctionnaires à régler à quelle place c'est le plus pratique, c'est pas à moi de faire ça.

Mais, il y a une chose que, comme citoyenne, que moi je veux voir, c'est que je veux voir sur les véhicules que ce soit indiqué que ce camion transporte des produits d'ordre toxique ou des produits dangereux, considérés dangereux, et que je puisse les lire. Ca m'intéresse pas de la même manière que quand je suis des camions de pitoune sur la route là, bien je m'arrête puis j'attends que le camion soit rendu plus loin parce que j'ai pas l'intention que la pitoune me tombe dessus, mais de la même manière comme ça s'est produit déja en Ontario que les camions étaient, les voitures ont été aspergées de PCB.

J'ai pas l'intention de faire ça et donc pour que je puisse prendre en main ma santé, ma sécurité, il faut que je sois informée. Et ça s'est un principe qui est reconnu. Je suis impliquée dans les syndicats, c'est un principe qui est reconnu dans toutes les lois de santé au travail. C'est le droit de savoir. Parce ce qu'on reconnaît que c'est à partir du droit de savoir qu'on peut exercer notre droit de se retirer ou notre droit d'exprimer notre position. Et je trouve qu'à l'heure actuelle tout est fait dans les anti-chambres sur la question des déchets et les citoyens en connaissent très peu.

A ce sujet-là vous avez posé la question, qu'est-ce qu'on pense de l'amiante en arrière du bureau de poste à Moncton? Je veux dire personnellement je considère que ça ne devrait pas être là.

Et je suis d'autant plus préoccupée que je sais qu'il y a près de trois cents employés du gouvernement fédéral qui travaillent dans l'édifice et les barils sont là sous les fenêtres, etc. Sauf que peut-être que ça prend ça pour que comme citoyen on commence à reconnaître... on dit souvent que les déchets s'ils sont loin de nous autres on s'en fout, peut-être que ça prend qu'on les a dans le centre ville pour commencer à s'en préoccuper. Je veux dire je ne souhaiterais pas à personne, j'enverrais pas des déchets juste pour que le monde prenne conscience, mais je me dis que peut-être que c'est ça que ça nous prend pour prendre... essayer de regarder le fond du problème et pas essayer de le "dumper" ailleurs.

J'aimerais faire un commentaire en général sur le plan d'action que votre comité semble proposer. Vous parlez au niveau de "landfill". OK. C'est ça, vous partez de la prémisse que c'est ce que ça nous prend, des "landfill". "Landfill", pour moi c'est un beau petit mot "fancy" pour dire un dépotoir. Parce ce que c'est ça que c'est, dans les faits. Je me demande pourquoi le comité, peut-être qu'il en a fait l'étude, mais pourquoi (en tout cas ça ne paraît dans les documents), pourquoi il prend comme prémisse qu'on va se débarrasser des déchets domestiques et commerciaux de cette façon-là? Il me semble qu'il faut qu'on fasse des études puis je suis bien d'accord avec M. Leblanc qui avait dit des études, des études on en a assez.

Je pense d'ailleurs qu'il y en a eu assez d'études qui démontrent que le recyclage c'est une solution qu'est beaucoup plus acceptable à long terme que remplir les près des rivières comme Petiticodiac. On sait fort bien que, que ce que qu'on est en train de "dumper" près de la rivière ça avec l'érosion, avec les gaz qui se créent, ça se rend dans l'eau, c'est dans l'air et il faut commencer à regarder le problème d'une façon globale. On ne peut pas se débarasser de nos déchets comme ça tout le temps, il va falloir qu'on commence à les regarder à la source et aussi à commencer à les réutiliser. Et il me semble que le comité, moi j'ai une recommandation à vous offrir, je ne sais pas si c'est la forme de faire des recommandations, une recommandation que je ferais c'est que le comité propose au gouvernement d'adopter une règlementation sur la fabrication.

Par exemple, mais ça je veux dire c'est peut-être une goutte d'eau dans l'océan mais les bouteilles retournables versus des bouteilles non-retournables versus les cannettes, etc. C'est une petite affaire, mais il faut commencer quelque part.

Qu'on rende obligatoire les fabricants de bière, etc, d'utiliser des bouteilles retournables et j'espère qu'il n'y a personne qui va me servir le chantage économique que j'ai entendu plus tôt là sur la "spruce spraying", la tordeuse, ça c'est du beau chantage économique que bon, on va perdre les "jobs", si on commence à s'occuper de l'environnement. C'est bien de valeur, je veux dire une "job" quand, c'est la même manière que quoi ça me sert d'une "job", je veux dire si je suis morte. Ca sert pas à grand chose. Il va falloir qu'on commence à penser à long terme. C'est pas seulement par rapport aux enfants, il y a par rapport à la jeunesse qui est en voie, mais il y a aussi par rapport à nous autres. A l'heure actuelle, on bois de l'eau polluée, on est en train de s'étouffer complètement, il va falloir qu'on commence à penser aux problèmes à la source et il va falloir qu'il y ait des interventions gouvernementales pour règlementer la production de l'industrie.

Ca ça peut signifier qu'on va perdre des "jobs" dans l'immédiat mais on va en créer aussi, si on crée des "jobs" sur le recyclage. Moi je suis tout à fait prête à séparer mes déchets humides de mes "cans" puis mes verres, des bouteilles, etc. Puis d'ailleurs peut-être que j'arrêterais d'en consommer autant s'il fallait que je les divise.

Il faut pas... on considère que les problèmes de déchets, je veux dire je ne veux pas nier l'importance de déchets industriels, je pense que c'est très important. Mais il ne faut pas minimiser le fait que les déchets domestiques et commerciaux au Nouveau-Brunswick sont très importants à raison de cinq cent mille tonnes par année qu'on produit au Nouveau-Brunswick... des déchets domestiques je veux dire. Mon p'tit sac de poubelle Glad là, je veux dire, ça m'a pas l'air bien gros une fois par semaine, mais je veux dire on en produit cinq cent mille tonnes de ça, des p'tits sacs de poubelle Glad.

Donc, je pense qu'il faut absolument que votre comité regarde à la règlementation sur la fabrication. Il peut pas seulement regarder, comme ils disent en anglais le "end result". Il faut commencer à regarder à la source.

J'aimerais en plus de ça, faire un commentaire sur la question des commissions régionales. Alors que je reconnais qu'effectivement un des gros problèmes sur la question de la gestion ou le manque de gestion des déchets au Nouveau-Brunswick, vient du fait que la population a été très peu impliquée.

Je veux dire on vient y "dumper" ses affaires, nos déchets ici et là, puis après ça on dit mon Dieu, on a une "dump" en arrière dans la cours. Je reconnais fort bien que ce manque de consultation-là est important. Sauf que je suis pas certaine, je ne peux pas me prononcer catégoriquement mais je pose la question. Je ne suis pas certaine que les commissions régionales ce n'est pas un façon pour le gouvernement fédéral de se débarasser d'une patate chaude. A chaque fois qu'on a eu au Nouveau-Brunswick une régionalisation de la gestion des services que ce soit en éducation, en services hôspitaliers, on a eu, ça a été accompagné d'une réduction des budgets. Ca fait là, on "dump" ça aux municipalités, aux conseils régionaux puis on dit on va vous donner le tant d'argent, puis arrangez-vous avec ça, puis là, venez pas nous brailler dans les bras parce ce que vous avez pas assez d'argent. On l'a entendu ce discours-là assez souvent, au niveau de l'éducation puis de la santé puis d'autres services essentiels.

Alors que la question de la gestion des déchets implique un financement important. Il va falloir qu'on y mette de l'argent si on veut faire quelque chose. Je veux pas dire que ça soit seulement de l'argent venant de l'état, de nos taxes en tant que citoyen, mais aussi il va falloir que l'industrie investisse de l'argent. L'industrie retire suffisamment de profits à partir de ressources de droit de coupes sur les terres de Nouveau-Brunswick qu'il va falloir qu'elle commence à payer pour les déchets qu'elle crée. Et je pense que c'est là qu'il faut commencer à regarder; c'est au niveau du financement et assurer un financement adéquat et là on pourra regarder à l'infrastructure de la hiérarchie.

Et finalement, j'aimerais poser une question au Conseil ou au comité. Je sais que ce n'est pas très courtois de poser des questions comme ça mais j'ai jamais eu comme prétention d'être courtoise, qui est-ce qui nomme les membres de ce Conseil? Et la raison pourquoi je pose la question, je ne vais pas me cacher, c'est que je me demande quelle sorte de recommendations peuvent être faites par un Conseil où siègent des gens qui sont en train, je ne parle pas de tous les membres, bien entendu? Mais je peux en nommer un parce ce qu'il était intervenu suffisamment fort, M. Kerr, qui ont des intérêts. Il y a des intérêts qui se situent au niveau du profit, et non au niveau de l'environnement. Mais j'avale pas le commentaire que oui on sait ce qu'on a à faire avec des déchets parce qu'on suit les règlements du gouvernement. On sait fort bien aussi quel argent ils ont pour faire du lobbying pour s'assurer que le gouvernement passe pas de règlements qui dérangent. Ca fait, moi, je me demande c'est...qui les nomme, et comment? Quel pouvoir un comité comme le vôtre peut exercer dans ces conditions-là?

LAPIERRE:

Je crois que je peux répondre à votre dernière question. Les membres du Comité du Conseil de l'environnement sont nommés par le Ministre, par le gouvernement. En principe nommés par le Lieutenant-Gouverneur. Le choix des membres est fait, semblerait-il, afin de représenter la société du Nouveau-Brunswick. Alors, à l'intérieur de ça, on a des gens qui représentent comme au Nouveau-Brunswick on a de l'industrie.

Il y a des gens qui représentent l'industrie et ils viennent avec les idées de l'industrie. Il y a des gens qui représentent les citoyens et c'est à souhaiter qu'ils viennent avec l'idée des citoyens. Il y a des gens qui sont des professionels, il y a un avocat qui est sur Conseil, il vient probablement avec la mentalité d'un avocat. Il apporte la contribution des avocats ou d'un avocat. Il y a aussi des gens qui représentent les naturalistes, sur le comité. Il y a moi-même. Je sais pas trop qu'est-ce que je représente, mais en tous cas, je suis pas employé d'une compagnie. J'ai travaillé depuis longtemps à l'environnement et...en tous cas.

Je souhaite que pour améliorer l'environnement de la province du Nouveau-Brunswick. Alors, je crois que sans vous nommer tous les gens qui sont sur le comité, c'est dans cet aspect que le gouvernement a regardé la composition. C'est sûr qu'il y a des gens qui ont un comportement ou qui ont la mentalité de l'industrie, ils ont été nommés pour la répresenter. C'est en train d'essayer d'avoir une ou des idées sur l'environnement qui va repésenter tous les secteurs de la société du Nouveau-Brunswick, que le gouvernement a nommé le Conseil. On est treize membres sur le Conseil.

CARON:

Donc, ce que vous dites c'est que c'est le Ministre Harmer, le même personnage qui contrairement à ce que la loi sur (voyons, qu'est-ce que on appelle ça, l'épandage du truc pour) l'insecticide, qui lorsqu'il y a eu un "dumpage" accidentel, le même ministre qui avait dit qu'il y avait pas de preuves que ça n'avait pas été acccidentel alors que la loi dit que le fardeau de la preuve appartient à la compagnie de démontrer que ce n'était pas accidentel?

LAPIERRE:

Oui, mais c'est vrai, Harmer était le Ministre jusqu'il y a quelques mois, mais Harmer n'est pas responsable de la nomination de tous les membres sur le Conseil. Par exemple, j'ai à mon extrême droite ici, Ken Langmaid, qui était un pionnier du mouvement de conservation et de l'environnement au Nouveau-Brunswick qui est maintenant un individu retiré qui est sur Conseil je crois déjà, si je ne me trompe pas, depuis 12 ans. Alors, il a été nommé par des Ministres antérieurs. Il y a eu quelques nominations sur M. Harmer mais il sont, je crois c'est deux.

Je crois que si vous permettez, j'aurais quelques questions à vous poser. La première c'est que, contrairement à vos commentaires au début vous avez indiqué qu'on partait avec une prémisse. Nous on part, je crois qu'on part, sans prémisse, moi je vous ai fait part ce soir dans mon discours d'ouverture de la position du gouvernement. Et on est ici pour recueillir des commentaires sur la position du gouvernement mais nous on s'est pas formulé d'idées encore. Nos idées viendront dans notre rapport qui sera distribué au public dès qu'il sera terminé, et vous pourrez juger de la valeur de nos idées. Mais pour le moment on est ici pour écouter des personnes, comme vous, nous dire ce qu'ils pensent de l'environnement. A ce point de vue, je vous remercie de vos commentaires.

Maintenant, j'aimerais simplement revenir à un point, c'est le point de l'argent. Vous avez indiqué qu'il faut mettre beaucoup d'argent. Maintenant les commissions régionales comme vous l'avez indiqué, c'est remettre l'autorité aux gens dans les régions. Mais, est-ce que les déchets ne sont pas générés à l'intérieur des régions par des gens qui habitent dans l'intérieur des régions? Puis est-ce que vous croyez que les gens devraient en être responsables de la gestion de leurs déchets?

CARON:

Si vous proposez que j'ajoute, j'attache des piastres à mon sac de vidange, c'est une façon de financer ça. Sauf que dans un système comme le nôtre, l'état providence qu'est pas très providenciel de ce temps-là, à ce moment-là, on paye des taxes pour s'assurer des services. Sauf que très souvent ça dévie vers d'autres choses, mais en tous cas. C'est ça le principe derrière. C'est qu'on paye des taxes pour s'assurer des services. Et ou est-ce que c'est qu'est le plus gros pourcentage de la taxation va? C'est à l'état provincial.

Alors que, et, l'état municipal et régional, régional qui existe pas encore, mais en reçoit une partie, mais une partie qui est minime par rapport à la transmission de toutes les services qu'on est en train d'y faire tomber dessus. Alors, moi je me dis qu'il va falloir que par rapport à la taxation, c'est que celui qui reçoit la plus grosse partie de la taxation soit responsable de la plus grosse partie. Parce ce que moi je considère que les déchets, ou la gestion des déchets c'est un service d'ordre publique. A moins qu'on veut faire comme Reagan puis Mulroney, s'en aller toute sur l'entreprise privée puis là, bien, j'attacherais ma piastre sur mon sac de poubelle puis ils ramasseront comme ça.

LAPIERRE:

Alors si je comprends bien, vous, vous voyez un financement provincial, un financement de la taxe foncière pour la gestion des dépotoirs régionals?

CARON:

S'il y a une autre alternative, je veux pas rentrer dans toute la mécanique de comment ça peut se faire, bien il y a d'autres alternatives. C'est à dire qu'il y a une réduction de la taxation provinciale, puisqu'on nous réduit nos services et que là, à ce moment-là, on les paye aux municipalités. Ca doit être un problème pour les municipalités non incorporées, mais ça je veux dire...

LAPIERRE:

Je suis d'accord mais si on revient à une de vos idées, des premières idées que vous avez énoncées, c'était sur le récyclage et qu'on devrait faire un peu de recyclage. Ne croyez-vouz pas que si les gens ont à payer sur une base régionale, l'entreposage de leurs déchets qu'ils vont peut-être être incités de trouver des moyens pour éliminer le volume qu'ils produisent et qu'on pourrait peut-être inciter le recyclage à l'intérieur des régions et que la région que s'incite à recycler, elle se verra par le fait même réduite, le coût va être réduit si elle le finance. Tandis que si vous allez sur une quote provinciale comme c'est pour le moment, financé un peu par tête de pipe, parce ce que c'est comme ça que ça se finance actuellement, vous incitez peu les gens du recyclage mais au niveau local pourrait être incité de recyclage.

CARON:

Je ne suis pas une specialiste de ces questions de recyclage et des expériences qui ont été faites. Mais je pense qu'il y a eu certaines expériences qui ont été faites aux Etats-Unis et ce qu'on a découvert, c'est que sur une base volontaire, parce qu'il faut pas prendre les citoyens pour des nouilles non plus. Si on leur donne l'information, je veux dire, les citoyens sont capables de prendre certaines responsabilités. Moi je veux dire j'aimerais bien que l'usine de Scoudouc vienne ramasser les bouteilles ici comme elle les ramasse à Shédiac, je serais même prête à ramasser toutes les bouteilles sur ma rue, je veux dire. Je sais que je suis peut-être exceptionelle, mais je pense que les gens sont capables de diviser dans un sac de papier pour telles sortes de déchets et l'autres sortes de déchets, et si je rencontre des gens de Shédiac, ils le font de façon très volontaire cette division-là. Donc c'est une question d'éducation et les expériences d'après ce que j'ai vu, les expériences qui ont été faites aux Etats-Unis, les gens d'une base volontaire ont embarqué dans le système. Et c'est pas parce qu'ils allaient être plus ou moins taxés. Ils ont même pas eu, ils avaient cette provision-là dans leurs "bylaws" locaux, ils n'ont même pas eu à l'utiliser parce qu'il y avait un volume suffisant de gens qui participait au programme. Donc, je ne me ferais pas des peurs avec ça.

LAPIERRE:

Non, on a simplement pour votre information, il y au Nouveau-Brunswick la ville de Fredericton qui a un programme de recyclage actuel où la participation est assez grande mais le volume qu'il reçoit est assez faible. Alors, je ne sais pas si les gens vont sortir quelques papiers, quelques bouteilles, mais le volume pour faire marcher l'industrie semble être insuffisant...

CARON:

Je m'excuse mais je pense que le problème à Fredericton ce n'est pas un problème de participation à la base. C'est un problème d'infrastructure de la compagnie de recyclage qui marche sur des bouts de ficelles pour aller chercher des choses. C'est là que le problème est. Il faut une infrastructure qui est suffisante et qui est capable d'aller le chercher. Il ne faut pas fonctionner sur un système de broches à foin. C'est vrai qu'ils n'ont pas le volume, mais ils ne vont pas le chercher le volume.

LAPIERRE:

D'accord. Merci encore une fois pour vos commentaires.

Oui, il y a quelques autres intervenants, il y a M. Mehra qui avait demandé et il y a une autre personne, puis après ça il y avait Ghislain et Vanya...

MEHRA:

My name is Mool Mehra. I am a professor at the Université de Moncton. I am also involved not only in teaching chemistry but some work with the environmental aspects of it. So my remarks will be rather brief because my two colleagues have very eloquently put forward some of those ideas before.

But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, you started off your comments today by giving us an idea that we are talking of the environment and its protection not only for us, for the generations to come. Obviously this is very much uppermost in the minds of all of us who are involved in this type of activity what best we can contribute to protecting today for tomorrow. In this respect what we are talking today about these toxic and the hazardous wastes, we're talking essentially two problems. One is the solid waste and one are the liquid ones. In my opinion the solid are a little easier to handle because of its compactness. Where the immediate problem comes around is by handling the liquid wastes which may be because of the corrosive character or because of the other toxic effects are a little bit more involved and required technology or the knowledge of the subject a little deeper than the other one. Although eventually treatment system may eventually turn out to be the same in all the cases.

You talk, Mr. President, in the beginning that we are producing at the rate of about 1,800 to 2,000 tons of toxic waste or hazardous waste in New Brunswick. I'm sure in the years to come when we get a little bit more industrialization in this whole area, we'll be increasing this waste by several forms, and certainly storing is not the problem. We can't store on a temporary basis for a certain length of time. Eventually, we'll have to deal with this problem right to its cause how we can treat it and eventually dispose of it. I'm reminded of a few years of my (tape inaudible) in the nuclear industry. The industry started some 40 years ago but today still we are stuck with the liquid waste problem coming from spent fuels. So obviously, the toxic waste will pose as the same problems in the years to come.

It is high time, in my opinion, that New Brunswick should take a lead, at least in the Atlantic area, by setting up its own research and development centres which will be capable of handling these type of problems as they present today or they'll present tomorrow. So I'm lending, as a matter of fact, support to my colleagues who have put forward this idea that it is time our government or our industry should join hands together in setting up this system going so that we have a better future for tomorrow. Not only that but our (tape inaudible) policies like the Research Council of Canada for Engineering and Sciences, they also recommend there should be some sort of a partnership between the University, industry and the other sectors of the society. Maybe this is another example how three can combine together to solve the problems which concern all the citizens. So I'll be keeping my remarks to this particular aspect, brief.

If we have these research centres of these recent development entities, we had a little a comment made by one biologist who said he's unemployed, maybe then he has a chance here to contribute, not free, but certainly in a useful and reproductive way. So we have this long term and short term objectives. If we keep this in mind certainly not only will we be contributing to this deductions of the waste but at the same time we'll be conserving the environment for the future generations to come. This is my, Mr. President, first remark.

Second remark is regarding the point which was touched upon in one of the earlier comments that at the source of production of a particular product we have a possible control. Now certainly this is very uppermost in my mind when I think of one example where some of the toxic compounds are sold cheaper in the market than the non toxic ones although they serve the same purpose. What is in my mind is, for example, the gasoline. The leaded gasoline which contains lead we know is a top priority pollutant in the environment. It is sold at a cheaper price than the non-leaded gasoline which is sold at a much more expensive price. Certainly this is one way of recycling our thinking, our philosophy where we cannot only save the environment, but certainly save us the cost also. So I will not go into great details. These are the two points I wanted to make that not only at the time of deciding of what we can do for the future, we can help also to look at the products that we are putting in the market, this point has been touched upon earlier so I will not dwell on that, so I'll limit myself to these two remarks. I thank you very much for the opportunity.

LAPIERRE:

I guess as the time is moving on, we'll go to some other people who have not had a chance to speak yet before we go back to questions. Alors, Ghislain, si tu veux t'identifier...

POTIER:

Mon nom est Ghislain Potier. Je suis étudiant en biologie à l'Université de Moncton. Puis je voudrais parler aujourd'hui surtout en tant que futur payeur de taxe parce ce qu'éventuellement c'est moi qui va, avec tous les autres étudiants, qui s'en viennent sur le marché du travail, qui vont être obligés d'assurer les coûts en fin de compte des futurs projets qui sont en train de se mettre en marche.

Alors, en tant qu'individu, personnellement, moi je suis prêt à assurer une partie des coûts qui seront nécessaires pour payer, défrayer la mise en place de tous les projets qui ont été suggérés ce soir de dépotoirs spécifiques, de même d'industrie de recyclage, etc. Mais surtout parce ce que je suis conscient que personnellment et puis que la plupart ici je suis certain aussi sont conscients qu'ils ne seraient pas capables nécessairement de se priver de tous les produits finis qui sortent de toutes ces grandes compagnies-là qui sont, qui résultent en fin de compte à la fin, à des produits toxiques avec lesquels on est pris.

Moi personnellement je crois pas du tout qu'il y en a pas une persone ici qui serait capable de se priver de la moitié des biens qu'ils ont dans leurs maisons, puis qui sont produits par ces industries-là qui en fin de compte nous donnent aussi les déchets toxiques. On les utilise, on produit des déchets personellement. J'ai vu dans une de vos brochures où c'était mentionné qu'on produisait environ une demi tonne de déchets par individu par année. Donc, c'est beaucoup. Puis je suis certain que si on s'associe avec les industries pour défrayer des coûts de mise en place de ces projets-là, en fin de compte, à long term ça ne reviendrait pas si cher puis ça sera très efficace. Personnellement, moi je suis pour aider à financer en payant des taxes soit provinciales ou régionales, parce ce que moi je ne connais pas tellement encore les implications, les "gimmicks" du gouvernement, mais où là que ça sera plus efficace de payer puis de mettre, d'aider à mettre en place des systèmes qui seraient efficaces pour nettoyer notre environnement parce ce que j'ai envie de vivre dans un environnement qui est sain, puis j'ai envie d'en laisser un qui est sain à mes enfants futurs aussi.

Si on n'arrête pas de s'obstiner pour savoir qui doit payer, ça ne se fera jamais. Puis ce qu'on va faire, c'est qu'on va toujours continuer à escalader puis à accumuler des déchets puis à la fin on finira jamais par faire réduire ces quantités-là.

Un autre point que j'aimerais mentionner aussi, c'est au sujet des transports des matériaux, des produits toxiques, c'est qu'il y avait été suggeré un peu plus de bonne heure dans la soirée que les produits soient transportés dans les camions le soir pour éviter que le public soit conscient de ça puis des choses comme ça. Moi je suis totallement contre ça. Je trouve que c'est le contraire de ce qu'il faudrait faire, faudrait que ce serait le jour, que les camions soient très bien identifiés pour que le public sache qu'est-ce qui est transporté, où c'est transporté, puis il me semble qu'il ferait bien plus attention, tu vas pas dépasser un camion qu'est remplis de 50,000 litres de produits toxiques, il me semble que c'est complètement stupide. Tu portes attention, et c'est comme Madame disait tout à l'heure, moi aussi je m'arrêterais sur bord de chemin, et je le laisserais passer le camion à place d'essayer de le dépasser et de créer un accident comme qui s'est passé en Ontario. C'est pas nécessairement une histoire dans ce genre-là mais... qui pourrait arriver dans ce style-là.

Surtout pour que le public en prenne conscience puis qu'il finisse par se rendre compte que ces déchets-là, bien ils sont autour puis il faut qu'il fasse de quoi avec, on a pas le choix, faut les entreposer à quelque part, faut les faire bouger, on n'a pas le choix, c'est sur les routes ou vers la terre.

La dernière chose c'est qu'un peu plus tôt, quand un autre de mes confrères étudiant est venu parler, on a posé la question à savoir si on était bien informé dans les laboratories au sujet de comment disposer des produits toxiques qu'on se sert, comme les acides puis les produits chimiques. Je crois que la seule fois que, non je pourrais en nommer deux fois, où on nous a spécifié où il fallait aller déposer les produits. Par exemple, dans les laboratoires de chimie, on nous disait où aller porter les acides et puis certains produits qui étaient toxiques sous les hottes disons on ne savait pas qu'est-ce qui se passait avec exactement par après, c'est peut-être simplement ce que nous autres on aurait fait d'avance, les jeter à l'évier. Puis encore, la deuxième fois, c'était avec des microrganismes qu'on ...cette année on se sert, on nous dit de les placer dans un certain coin où ils seront apportés à l'autoclave pour être stérilisés puis anéantis.

C'est les deux seules fois j'ai vu ça. Puis souvent dans les labs de chimie de toute façon j'ai vu beaucoup d'étudiants puis je peux pas m'en cacher, je l'ai fait quelques fois aussi, qu'on prend...à place d'aller mener les produits sous la hotte, c'est bien plus simple de rinçer notre plat juste au dessous de l'évier qui est juste en face de nous autres puis de serrer ça. Les règlements sont là, mais ils sont pas tellement appliqués puis c'est pas sévère et puis c'est ces petites choses-là, ça paraît pas tellement à la longue, mais c'est ces petites choses là qui font que nous autres mêmes en tant qu'individu dans la société, on est responsable, et on a vraiment un gros rôle à jouer dans le nettoyage futur de la societé, de l'environnement, si on veut vivre dans un environnement qui est sain.

Ce que je voudrais vraiment qu'il soit fait c'est qu'au niveau de tous les enseignants puis il y en a plusieurs enseignants ici j'en ai vu, qu'il y ait plus de sensibilisation de fait de même. La première fois où j'ai été vraiment sensibilisé, c'est cette année, puis je finis mon baccalauréat cette année. C'est un cours cette année ou c'est la première fois qu'on m'a sensibilisé à certains problèmes de ce type-là.

Je crois que ça aurait du être fait ça dans les premiers cours de chimie, ou les premieres cours de biologie qu'on a au secondaire puis même si c'est possible, avant ça. Je vous remercie beaucoup.

LAPIERRE:

J'ai une question pour toi avant que tu t'en vas Ghislain... Tu as indiqué que tu aimerais à voir que ces camions indentifiés sur la route. Tu sais quand on voyage des maison mobiles sur la route, on a un camion qui circule en avant avec un feu clignotant et parfois même un en arrière. Est-ce que tu verrais aller jusqu'à ce point-là pour des transports de produits toxiques en les identifiant comme il faut au public?

POTIER:

J'aimerais une très bonne identification. J'aimerais que ça soit visible mais pas nécessairement qu'il y ait un convoi de 30 véhicules simplement pour assurer la sécurité d'un seul camion de liquide, mais quand même il y a sûrement des moyens qui existent pour mettre en place un système de transport qui serait facilement mis sur pied puis ça serait, il y aurait des choses visibles lesquels le public pourrait être conscient puis à la longue s'habituer puis prendre des responsabilités qu'il a envers ces transports là, donc de les laisser passer. On laisse même passer les ambulances puis les camion pompiers. Bien il me semble que les déchets toxiques aussi c'est aussi important que quelqu'un qui meurt parce que les déchets-là mais ça pourrait être la cause de prochains tranports d'individus par ambulance.

LAPIERRE:

Merci, Ghislain. Vanya? Tu pourrais t'identifier s'il vous plaît.

V. LEBLANC:

Hello my name is Vanya Leblanc. I'm a biology student at the the University of Moncton, l'Université de Moncton. And I wanted to bring up a point that's been mentioned previously but it's very important to me and although I'm nervous speaking to so many professionals, it's too important to leave out, I feel.

I think that one of our problems is, for instance you've come to hear our opinions. I'm not sure what our opinions were because I feel that no matter how well we try to inform ourselves, we're always going to get the short end of the stick. Because of the way the publicity involved in these things is handled.

I can cite a few examples. Budworm spraying, for instance. I know there have been a certain number of plane crashes although we don't know how much and if any spray has actually leaked into the crash sites and if these have happened in water reservoirs or in other places where there would be runoff and this would reach anything that would reach people or wildlife or other forms of life that could be affected by this spray.

Another example that also relates to the budworm spray is the information as to the danger of being sprayed. I know that the Girl Guides not very long ago were going to go to a camp and they were going to sleep overnight at the camp for a special badge. I know that the budworm spray was to be sprayed on the weekend these girls were going out to camp and that they would be sprayed if they were sleeping out in their sleeping bags in their little lean to's. Now the forest ranger informed the Girl Guides that this spray was no more dangerous than hairspray. That oh, let your kids be sprayed, that's alright.

However, when we consulted more professional health authorities, they informed us that no, they would not let their children go out in the spray, that they didn't think it was safe. And these are professionals we did speak to. Now, they also informed us that they can't make that public to us unless we go and ask them. Well, what kind of a system is this if we have to go and knock at their door and say sir tell me if we can go out in this? And we have to go fiddling around trying to find this information and that they don't make it public to us and that we ourselves, or our children, or anyone else could go get exposed without being aware of the dangers and then five years later they might wonder what's wrong with their child.

Another example I can site is the case of asbestos. In a high school in Petitcodiac, a few years ago, there was asbestos in the ceilings. I don't know if it's still there or not. Now at the time, the New Brunswick government said, that's OK if there is, that's right check the ceiling in here and don't breathe too hard. Now, the New Brunswick government said, oh well that asbestos, that's harmless. The high school principal said the same thing, that won't hurt our students, that's only asbestos.

However, within three months of that incident, when the New Brunswick government realized that in the Centennial Building, where they work a lot of the time, there was also asbestos in the ceiling. Oh, that was a big emergency, they had to go get that asbestos right out of their ceiling right away because they were there, not just some poor little students from Petitcodiac.

Now, I find a double standard here and I don't think we're being fair to ourselves in believing that we know what's going on cause I think we have reason to believe that we're out of control because of secrecy. An example I could site is when Mr. Dave Kerr said that the industries are taking care of their chemicals, well, I hesitate to take his word for it because of my experience with previous incidents. We don't have reason to trust the government or industries.

KERR:

What I said is we know how to take care of them, I didn't say that we were taking care of them. I said we know how. The question was, the statement was made that we didn't know how to handle toxic wastes.

V. LEBLANC:

That again is another example of how we can, in this case, perhaps this is what Mr. Dave Kerr said, but it's an easy way to play with words and make us feel confident when we have no reason to be confident.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much.

TAYLOR:

I have just one little question.

LAPIERRE:

Vanya, I wonder if you would mind answering a few questions? Just short questions, OK? Go ahead Helen.

TAYLOR:

You mentioned that you weren't well enough informed, or we aren't well enough informed and it's, as another lady suggested, the right to know beforehand. Do you feel the press play an important enough a role in these situations? Should they not be more investigative perhaps in their reporting? This is one of the ways we're going to know, is just through the press and ...

V. LEBLANC:

Well, that's a very interesting point, I think the press, it would be an advantage to us if the press would or could, I'm not sure how all that works now, the ins and outs of that, delve into this stuff more in detail and really make it known to us, you know, it's happening to us, we're part of the environment, we don't own it. To know what's going on but as Mr. Beukeveld stated previously, the press is also another one of these closed circles because my mother had noticed when there were building Point Lepreau that many articles that came out in the Evangéline, which was a privately owned newspaper, the French language, that articles concerning Point Lepreau or budworm spray for that matter would appear in the Evangéline newspaper that wouldn't appear in the Times and Transcript which is an Irving-owned newspaper and I found that perhaps it was an accidental omission but it didn't look to be and so I detect a conflict of interest so I don't know if we can trust the press either. I mean, sure the journalists are working hard but they're under another control, you know.

TAYLOR:

Thank you.

LANGMAID:

My comment on the press... I've been involved for the last 30 years in environmental work, at the risk of my professional job, I might add. I find that the press will take anything that is sensational but if it's not sensational, to hell with you. That's a comment I've made.

LAPIERRE:

Vanya, I guess, I think that most comments you said are quite true and I think that there are stories and I think that many people like you have witnessed either through government action or at least other actions where they have reasons to doubt what's being told, but I guess, I hope that you believe it, we're sincere. We have come to listen and we're giving you a chance and anyone else here to say what's you have to say, we're going to listen to it, we did, and we have to write a report. Everything that you said may not be in it but we have to make some recommendations at the end. However, I just wanted to underline that we're really, you know, sincere in coming out to listen to people.

Most of us here would have other things to do, in the evenings and we have to travel throughout the province. We take time because we believe in what we do. So, I hope that tomorrow's environment will be better than today's through the work that we do and through the time that you took to come here to speak to us. Thank you.

V. LEBLANC:

I just have one last comment to make. I hope I didn't mix up my words and make it seem as it I didn't believe in your sincerity. I believe in your sincerity. I'm glad you're there and I believe that you're listening to us. The only thing I question is that whether we've really been properly informed enough to give you pertinent information and also I hope that the government will take you seriously when they have their hands on your report.

LAPIERRE:

I'm sure that anything that you said, whatever you say, every citizen when he says something, I'm sure he is informed. He speaks his mind or her mind. And I thing that's important. I think one of the problems is that in society, we often tend to criticize government but we mustn't also forget that in a democracy we have the government that we merit as times. So, we have to take time and come out and speak our minds. I think it does help.

SMITH:

I think that maybe somebody from the New Brunswick Environment might comment on this spray thing. There is a hot-line number and so on during spray season and I think you're quite open about the hazards. Is there somebody who's able to comment on that?

LUTES:

I guess going back to 1976, the performance back about the mid '70's in terms of informing the people and having proper controls on the forest spray operations were not good back them. Having served on the provincial Pesticides Advisory Board myself for five years, I've seen how the changes have occurred and there have been some very dramatic changes so that in recent years, the forest spray program is fairly well advertised in all the local newspapers. The spray zones are identified, telephone numbers are published to get information, District Medical Health Officers, Department of Health Offices have information on the effects of having been sprayed, so that if you are accidentally sprayed there's telephone numbers so that you can get in touch with the proper health authorities to get more information.

I think if you look back through the records in the last four or five years, the number of incidents have dropped quite dramatically. The thing is as each year goes by, better controls are being imposed and I think we're improving all the time.

One point I might make is from my own personal perspective is because of the number of various citizens groups, environmental groups and whatnot there's been a lot of focus over the last decade on the forest spray program and in many cases for very good reasons. In some areas of the Province way back in the boondocks, where nobody lives, I'm not saying that we should relax the controls but we should place equal control on the application of pesticides around the home. I've seen many cases where we are very stringent on the operations 25 miles into the woods. Special types of helicopters with a special type of spray bar, special types of nozzles and someone around a populated area, because we had the infestation of the worms five or six years ago, everyone in a particular neighborhood wants their worms killed for aesthetic reasons primarily. And we get these people in spraying with backpacks and we've got kids playing in the neighborhood and that's where the real exposure is coming in so we've got to balance the two.

The whole idea, I guess, is that we have to recognize that there is a need for these pesticides. The real challenge here is to get 100% control so that we use these pesticides only when we absolutely have to.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you Mr. Lutes. Vanya, do you have any other comments?

V. LEBLANC:

I just wanted to say I'm glad to hear that's there are improvements come about and I'm also glad to hear that you are aware of the home problem too with pesticides. Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

Mr. Hill?

HILL:

If I may just take a second to add something to Bob's remarks, specifically to Vanya's concern about pesticides. One of the things that I have to do as Information Officer for the Department, and I've done it for many years, is answer the telephone from news media people and concerned citizens with regard to environmental issues.

Since I've been working for the Environment Department, this goes back several years now, I agree with Bob that as the controls under the Pesticide Control Act have become more firm over the years the number of questions, concerns, expressions of concern from the public about the forest spray has dropped. I just think in terms of going back five years ago and how my phone used to ring during the spruce budworm season in comparison to say last year there has been a drop, but what has been also changing, and I think partly as a result of work by the Provincial Pesticide Advisory Board and some of our staff in the Department as well, is there has been a corresponding increase in focus on concern about pesticide usage, for example, in agriculture in the Province.

Some of the publications that you may see around that have been produced by the Department in the last couple of years have been increasingly focussed on things like, that Bob was mentioning, use of pesticides around the home but agricultural usage of pesticides is often more concentrated.

It takes place closer to where people live in the agricultural parts of the Province than is the case in the forest spray. So we've seen in our own office quite a change over the last three to five years whereas five years ago or so the concerns that we were hearing from media and the public tended to be around the forest spray whereas increasingly now the concerns are about pesticides usage in agricultural areas, the potential of contamination of groundwater and so on.

So, that's an emerging issue in the Province which we'll probably hear more of in the future. Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

Moving on, there's a few people that asked for a second comment. I wonder if you could summarize it in one minute and then we could...oh Mrs. Leblanc you didn't get a chance yet. Go ahead Mrs. Leblanc.

M. LEBLANC:

I'll try to be short. My name is Millie Leblanc and I'm just a citizen and I want to commend you on holding these hearings. A couple of years ago I think 1982 or 1983, the federal government was suggesting putting a central toxic waste site in the Maritimes. I don't know what happened to that. I know that a couple of places, one place in Nova Scotia was suggested and I guess, if you'll excuse the expression, all hell broke loose. The idea seemed to die. I don't know if they were serious but it would seem to me to be a very good idea.

Another thing, we're missing here is maybe we're thinking a bit too provincially because all the trucks with Nova Scotia waste will be going through New Brunswick and therefore maybe we should be working with them in some of our efforts to decide what we're going to do with these things, because we're going to get their wastes unless we have a central high-heat incinerator in the Maritime region. We're going to get all their wastes all through our Province. And there will be accidents. As Mr. Gilcrest mentioned accidents are going to happen. We have to face that.

Another thing, another point that bothers me a bit... I was driving into Moncton one cold night last December and you'd swear the city was on fire. I had to close my car window, the smoke was terrible. People are burning every kind of thing in their woodstoves and their fireplaces and I see no publicity about this. Outside my front door some days smells, I don't know, as bad as Saint John. OK? Almost anyway. So, I don't think it's very healthy and I think we should have more publicity on what should be burned and shouldn't been burned. That is not a high-heat incinerator for plastics and all kinds of things.

I don't know if this is still going on but a few years ago one of my daughters worked in Sackville and I went down to visit her one night and we had to close the window because the smoke from the dump was seeping in and in this age when we know about dioxins and everything I felt a little bit uncomfortable. It was drifting right over Mount A. Now they fixed it in Sackville but where else in the Province...is this still a concern? Because garbage isn't fit to burn these days, no painted wood or Pentoxed wood, all these things. So that I wonder if this is happening. It's only about a year or two since Sackville changed its system.

I asked last fall how to get rid of some kerosene. I asked at the store where I bought it and they said to flush it down the toilet. I had about three gallons. It's not that much but if everybody in Moncton flushed three gallons, I don't know. It doesn't sound too good to me. I asked at the fire department and they said to flush it too but my neighbour told me that I could use it to clean my paint brushes so OK, but how many, in the home, again the fact of education. I don't think we have enough publicity and we're throwing away all sorts of things that just shouldn't go where they are going.

Another thing I wondered, the man from Cocagne earlier mentioned the signs at the coastline. Well, I've seen a lot of places where I know that I shouldn't take clams but there's no signs because they get taken down, but the signs on the highway can't be taken down, so I wonder if we couldn't enforce that a bit better that if things aren't, these aren't wastes but they are hazardous products, I think, at least they tell us they might be.

And just in closing, I'd like to say that when it comes to money for these things, we spend money for defence somebody mentioned spending money for defence and we have all kinds of money for a lot of things that maybe are just going to kill somebody else somewhere in the world.

I kind of think that this is the enemy within, this will hurt our children as much things that can be sent from other countries to destroy us. This is the enemy within and I think maybe we should treat it in that realm. I know it's late, so I won't go on.

LAPIERRE:

Thanks a lot for your comments. I wonder if you might stay there for a moment please. Ken?

LANGMAID:

The Maritime thing developed to the point that the one in Nova Scotia was considered the safest place to put it and they said no damn way. So it disappeared. The other thing about dioxins and things, your smoke from burning wood is loaded with them. Now they want to put a 30,000 ton a year generator in Fort Fairfield just across the border from Maine that will be generating stuff like this.

M. LEBLANC:

Can we do anything to stop that or to?

LANGMAID:

I don't know if that can be stopped or not. We're trying to stop them putting the radioactive materials next to the border too.

M. LEBLANC:

I heard about that, it's quite bad.

HILL:

It's just a response to Mrs. Leblanc's point about wood smoke from people burning all kinds of things in their fireplaces and woodstoves. When you talk about publicity and environment issues, you're looking at the guy who's supposed to be doing that. We have some of our publications here this evening that talk about hazardous waste and so. We have a few of our pesticides publications and we have a range of other publications.

The hottest publication that we've ever produced is a little brochure that came out about ten months ago called Wood Stoves, Air Pollution and Fire Safety. We've had to reprint that publication three times now. I've sent out 65,000 copies of that publication in the last ten months. We have about 200 left in the office, give me your name and address, I'll be pleased to send you one. It is the most enormous response we've ever had to any of our environmental publications. We printed it jointly with the other four Atlantic provinces and the Evironmental Protection Service of Environment Canada in Halifax and in total there was about 200,000 copies printed last spring and they all went in about two months and the issue of what people are burning in their woodstoves and the kinds of air quality that you have in subdivisions and parts of communities where there's a heavy use of woodstoves is a growing issue right throughout Atlantic Canada. So we do have a publication and I'll be pleased to send it to you.

M. LEBLANC:

I'm glad to hear about your publication. That's great.

LAPIERRE:

I would if the time wasn't moving along so quickly, maybe ask Bob Lutes for one short comment on burning dumps. How many do we have? What are we doing?

LUTES:

I can't give you the exact number but we have a lot of them. The burning of garbage has been the normal manner, I guess, of disposing of wastes. Primarily because a municipality finds a site, they want to keep it for as long as they can. By setting fire to it you eliminate 85% of the volume, 85-90% of the volume so you keep the dump ten times as long.

We have tried, we are trying, starting two or three months ago issuing certificates of approval under our Water Quality Regulations to control the burning at these sites and this as, I mentioned earlier on, the problem with some of the municipal Councils. The idea is number one to stop the burning, and number two to get the municipalities thinking more along the lines of what's involved in a sanitary landfill. Even if it means covering the garbage on a daily or twice or three times a week basis. It's getting them thinking about the scope and the solution to this problem.

But I would say, you know, probably at least half of the 250 sites in the Province or probably more than half are burning and I think Mrs. Leblanc's comment is a good one, that most of the garbage in the dumps nowadays is not fit to burn. We're getting all kinds of exotic things going to sites. When you torch these things, you get low temperature incineration, you get very poor combustion, you get all kinds of exotics coming off. They're spewing, they may not bother the local neighborhood but they're getting into the atmosphere and like acid rain, they're coming down to earth and building up in the water table. That's the sort of thing we've got to get control on.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you Mr. Lutes. That might help you Mrs. Leblanc. There were two people for a one minute comment. There's one in the back and I'd ask the ones who are coming back for a short one minute please, because let's move along.

BEUKEVELD:

Well, Mr. Chairman I take exception to that, unless you're going to bodily carry me out, we don't get to talk to you very often and I'm going to take the time to address some of the concerns that arrive to me. My name is Bernard Beukeveld and first of all, I would like to ask you a question. Do we have an official delegation of the city of Moncton?

LAPIERRE:

I guess I can ask the...the only thing I can do (tape inaudible)

BEUKEVELD:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make it known on the record that the city of Moncton is not present at this important hearing and I hope the press will pick it up and make an issue out of it. Because it isn't very issued to the forefront that it concerns every citizen of the city of Moncton, therefore they should have been here.

Now, when we talk about pollution and controls of pollution and so forth, I think the manufacturing arena, or the manufacturing people could be a very great help to. There's such an animal on the block, it's called the material data sheet. I don't know what your people know about material data sheets, but it's a piece of paper that has nine or ten portions to it and on portion number two of that material data sheet you normally have a break down of a particular product that you have in your plant. You should have a product data sheet on all the products that you have within your premises. The manufacturers very conveniently do not disclose 100% of what product you're working with. I myself have handled material data sheets on many occasions and you're lucky to come up with 50% of the ingredients of what's in that product.

So, here again, horror stories galore. Students in their fourth year are graduating and on the fourth year they're starting to learn with what type of a product they're working with. I've been exposed to a little bit of an environment to do some testing, tetration fluids, to be checking engine oils for soil content. They don't give you any information on it.

Another item is that a particular cleaning product and the manufacturer very conveniently will state on one line, this product is compatible with aluminum. Well that tells you a whole lot about the product you're working with, doesn't it. So, the material, now I see some chuckles there at the head table there and I'm sure they're agreeing with me on that score. That when we really come to the crux of the matter, the information, knowledge, what to do, what not to do with the products, disclosure of the products and the ingredients of them.

Now, PCB burning, and here again, an article I read in the newspaper from Upper Canada that's manufactured, that's printed here in Moncton. An article on the PCB burning and some new testing equipment is on the block and the people that have reported these findings, find that their testing equipment is so finely tuned and so accurate that, by golly, the PCB that we are burning, which we know is harmful, we have a secondary product coming from that burning that is more harmful than the PCB, that we're burning. Now, you people are in the know, I just want to put that at your doorstep to research, after all you have a budget and so forth and you have the manpower. But there is a secondary product that is primary to the PCB after it's burned as far as harmfulness is concerned.

Controlling of the dumps, yes. But when you control the dump and the profit motive creeps in, in getting the waste disposed of, you're going to end up with night dumping. People who in the middle of the night will dispose of their toxic, hazardous waste because it's more profitable than to pay whichever governmental agency. Let's write in the regulations some very very stiff fines or even the loss of the license or the operation license of an illegal night dumper. Once we enter into that environment, that controlled dumping environment so that there is a great deterrent there to that person that that waste product will end up in the incinerator or in the approved manner it's disposed of.

Bottle versus cans. Garbage collection, we don't think about garbage collection as profitable. It's a necessity but all of a sudden when we go to recycling, what crops in his head up through the bushes, is profit. Who says recycling has to profitable? It doesn't need to be profitable. It is a necessity for us to be in this environment ten years from now, 30 years and 50 years from now. And from day to day to say today when I go to a bottle collection system in the city of Moncton, I'm going to have to be able to show the bottom line and the bottom line has to be in the black. That's a lot of hogwash.

Institutional incinerators. There we have a hot potato on our hands. We have public institutions funded by taxpayers that under cover of darkness will light their incinerator and the next morning you find the evidence on the ledge of your window in the form of soot, whatever they might have burned under the cover of darkness. And some times not so under the cover of darkness. There's got to be some scheme put in place what some of those institutions are allowed to burn in their inefficient incinerators that they have on plan. By golly, they're just burning I don't know how many hazardous waste products in those incinerators, soiled materials and so forth that are just soaked with pollutants and dangerous chemicals and what have you.

Just to wrap it up quickly, Mr. Chairman, you've been very patient with me and I want to thank you for that. The small garage operator of who ever, whatever that has a source of used engine oil. I personally know of places here in the city of Moncton that will have a 45 gallon barrel that's been converted into a stove and they have a block of wood in there, and they have a little barrel a little farther away from that stove and it's dripping in used engine oil. Now Texaco Canada Limited out of the goodness of their hearts didn't put on their cans that their oil could be cancer-causing.

And here we are, it's a known fact, research has proven out that used engine oil is carcinogenic, has all kinds of horror chemicals in with it and we're just burning them uncontrolled in private endeavors.

So, with that Mr. Chairman, I'm sure if I go sit down I'll wish I had mentioned something else, but here again, I want to thank you for the opportunity and I hope you'll take my comments at heart.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much sir. Your comments were much appreciated. There's another intervenor that hasn't spoken yet.

MARTIN:

Je m'appelle Gilles Martin. Je suis étudiant en biologie.

LAPIERRE:

Veux-tu monter le micro un petit peu, Gilles, s'il-vous-plaît?

MARTIN:

J'ai juste un petit commentaire... On a parlé dernièrement là. Je voudrais mette l'emphase sur le grand manque de sensibilisation de la population à ces problèmes-là. Parce ce que c'est évident que plus les gens seront impliqués, plus les gouvernements seront obligés d'agir et puis la chose sera facile par la suite, et puis si on se base sur le nombres de personnes ici ce soir on peut voir que les gens ne sont pas très très au courant de ce qui se passe.

LAPIERRE:

Merci, Gilles. Y a-t-il d'autres commentaires? Oui?

DOUCET:

Bonsoir, je m'appelle Gérard Doucet. Je suis comme individu. Je voulais juste poser la question sur ça qui c'est passé à Fairvale, à Saint Jean. Est ce que depuis ce temps là qu'il y a des lois qui sont, c'est seulement arrivé la semaine dernière je pense mais, ce que déjà, ce que en d'autres mots à Moncton les personnes qui donnent le même service. Est-ce qu'on surveille, est-ce qu'on dit vos déchets vous pouvez plus les jeter, ou bien?

GODIN:

Avant l'incident de Fairvale, on avait déjà faite une étude des nettoyeurs à sec. Puis, l'incident de Fairvale, je voudrais souligner que la contamination a résulté de la gestion des déchets sur le site même du nettoyer à sec et la contamination n'est pas reliée avec la pratique d'enfouir les déchets dans les depotoirs. A Moncton de fait la semaine passée on a deux techniciens du ministère de l'Environnement qui sont venus puis ils sont allés visiter deux des nettoyeurs à sec ici à Moncton, puis on est en train de travailler directement avec les nettoyeurs à sec puis spécifiquement ceux de Moncton. Encore on travaille plus, on est plus impliqués avec eux parce ce qu'ils produisent des volumes plus importants.

C'est des nettoyeurs à sec qui sont, qui font des plus grosses affaires que dans d'autres plus petites villes. Ca fait que, on est à travailler avec les nettoyeurs à sec. On n'a pas établi de règlements. On est en train d'étudier comment imposer un règlement et s'assurer qu'il va être suivi. Alors, c'est quelque chose qu'on veut faire. On veut prendre le contrôle de la petite entreprise finalement, de l'industrie de nettoyeurs à sec, puis après ça, toutes les industries vont y passer, on les passe quand on est au courant qu'il y un problème.

Les nettoyeurs à sec, oui on a l'intention de les contrôler, de mettre un contrôle effectif, on est à élaborer la manière de faire et les règlements et l'imposition des règlements, afin qu'ils soient suivis, pour pas que ce soit justement un règlement sur papier comme Monsieur disait plus tôt. Qu'un règlement sur papier, ça ne protège personne. Ca ne protège pas l'environnement. Ca fait qu'il faut qu'on ait et le règlement et la méthodologie pour le mettre en pratique. Le règlement et la mise en pratique ça va être dans les mois à venir. Pas dans les années à venir, mais dans les mois à venir, dans le cas du nettoyeurs à sec certainement.

DOUCET:

Merci. La seule autre chose à ce fait, j'aimerais d'adresser M. Lutes. C'est que peut-être ça reflète la mentalité générale moi je comprends pas vraiment comment ça marche. Il a donné l'exemple de cinq camions qui sont tombés, puis il y avait l'acide, ils ont mis quelques chose qui l'a mis neutre. En autre mots, une fois que c'est devenu neutre ça, c'est toujours du liquide. On ramasse ça puis on fait un trou dans la terre, puis on le met dans terre puis ça fini là. C'es-tu ça qu'arrive avec les déchets là?

GODIN:

C'est pas toujours aussi simple que ça et c'est pas exactement ça qui est arrivé. Dans le cas dont M. Lutes parlait plus tôt, le camion avait déversé, j'oublie le volume, on va dire, 5,000 gallons d'acide sur la terre... dans la neige c'était l'hiver. Alors, il y a eu énormément de chaux d'appliquée. Ce qui a été ramassé, c'était des camions de neige et de sol. L'acide avait fondu la neige puis avait dégelé une partie du sol. La chaux a été appliquée, s'est dissoute avec le mélange liquide, mais le mélange qui avait été ramassé finalement était un mélange solide beaucoup plus solide que liquide. Ce n'est pas dans tous les cas que la neutralisation va produire un produit inoffensif. Dans le cas de cet accident-là en particulier, la sorte d'acide qui avait impliqué, une fois neutralisée créait un produit qui n'était pas soluble dans l'eau.

Alors que de l'enfouir dans un dépotoir ça ne causait pas des problèmes de l'enfouissement à l'avenir. Dépendant des acides, ou dépendant des produits, le produit de neutralisation peut être enfoui ou dans certain cas le produit de neutralisation doit être envoyé à l'extérieur pour être traité par un firme experte dans ces choses-là.

DOUCET:

Merci! C'est tout.

LAPIERRE:

Merci Gérard. Est-ce qu'il y a d'autres commentaires? Si non, j'en profite pour vous remercier de votre passage ici ce soir. Vos commentaires sont certainement précieux pour nous. On cherche des commentaires des individus. On est venu vous solliciter puis ce soir on a reçu de très bons commentaires de toutes les personnes qui sont intervenues. Donc encore une fois au nom de mon équipe, des gens qui nous entourent ce soir, un gros merci.